

Comintern People
Losovsky on Trade Union Unity
Problems of the German C. P.


WORKERS OF THE WORLD,
UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



No.
7

Price
10c

New  **INTERNATIONAL** Books

NEW WORKS OF LENIN

**THE STRUGGLE FOR THE
BOLSHEVIK PARTY (1900-1904)**

Selected Works, Volume II

The most important writings of Lenin which helped make the Bolshevik Party into the invincible vanguard of the proletariat. The Bolshevik principles of organization, strategy, and tactics as set forth by Lenin in opposition to the Mensheviks.

568 pages, fully annotated.

\$2.00

•
FOR THE FIRST TIME IN ENGLISH

THE HOUSING QUESTION

By FREDERICK ENGELS

Now published for the first time in English, this is the treatise which was a source book for Lenin in his preparation of *State and Revolution*. In his exposure of middle-class housing reformers, Engels introduces a basic exposition of the Marxist theory of the state.

Marxist Library, Volume 23

75 cents

•
AUTHORITATIVE, COMPLETE

**THE SUMMARY OF THE FULLFIL-
MENT OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN**

By the State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R.

A complete summary of the plan based upon finally verified statistics, showing conclusively the success of socialist planning.

304 pages, with tables and charts

\$1.25

•
Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published twice a month in English, Russian, German, French,
Chinese and Spanish

VOL. XII

APRIL 5, 1935

No. 7

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

COMINTERN PEOPLE 315

NEW FABRICATIONS BY THE ENEMIES OF THE UNITY OF THE
TRADE UNION MOVEMENT 320
By A. LOSOVSKY

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR
THE UNITED FRONT 333
By MAURICE THOREZ

PROBLEMS OF THE GERMAN COMMUNIST PARTY

IMMEDIATE TASKS FACING THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF
GERMANY 344
By WILHELM PIECK

INTENSIFY THE STRUGGLE FOR THE UNITED FRONT OF THE
PROLETARIAT 356
By V. MULLER

DISCUSSION FOR THE SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE C. I.

THE PROCESS OF THE DEVELOPMENT TOWARDS FASCISM . . 373
By M. GALAS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"HERR EUGEN DUEHRING'S REVOLUTION IN SCIENCE" (ANTI-
DUEHRING) BY FREDERICK ENGELS 379
By T. B.

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, P. O. Box 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year, \$2; six months, \$1; single copies, 10 cents

In No. 8 of

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Editorials

Germany as the Chief Instigator of War in Europe
For the United Front, for the Unity of the Trade Union
Movement.

For World Trade Union Unity!

Letter of the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labor
Unions to the Bureau of the International Trade Union Federa-
tion.

For a Broad United Front in Japan

By TANAKA

Work in the Reformist Trade Unions in Australia

By J. BILLET

Towards the Seventh Congress of the C. I.

The Work of the Canadian C. P. Between the Sixth
and Seventh Congresses

By J. PORTER

Discussion for the Seventh Congress of the C. I.

Some Problems of Fascism

By R. PALME DUTT

•
Insure yourself getting every issue.

SUBSCRIBE NOW

\$2 PER YEAR. \$1 FOR SIX MONTHS

•
Send your subscription to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

Comintern People

*Und als die Richter ihr Geschäft begannen
Stand einer von den Kommunisten auf
Stand einer auf mit lacheldner Gebärde
Und sprach vom Tag, der einmal Kommen werde,
Den blutenden fünf Sechsteln diesser Erde. . . .*

(Erich Weinert. . . . Dimitroff)*

FEBRUARY 27 marked the completion of a year since the liberation of George Dimitroff, one of the old leaders of the Communist International, a great proletarian revolutionary who embodied in his single-handed fight at the Leipzig trial against all the forces of loathsome German fascism, all the majesty of the working class which is marching irresistibly to the victory of socialism throughout the world.

March 3 marked the completion of two years since the fascist dungeons have held our Teddy,** Ernest Thaelmann, one of the leaders of the Communist International, born of the flesh and blood of the working class of Germany, one whose name has brought tremors of fear to the German bourgeoisie, and who lives in the hearts of millions of German toilers as the symbol of their liberation from the detested oppression of fascism and capitalism.

On February 8, hangman Horthy's judges passed a sentence of life-long imprisonment on Mathias Rakosi, former secretary of the Communist International, one of the glorious leaders of the proletarian dictatorship in Hungary, one who for ten years has steadfastly withstood the mockery of the fascist jailers.

These are Comintern people. They are the incarnation of the program of the Communist International. They represent a generation of leaders of the working-class movement, before whose eyes the old Social-Democracy has rotted and disintegrated, leaders who have grown and become steeled by the teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, and who were trained by the Communist International under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin. They represent a generation of leaders of the working class in the epoch of the proletarian revolution.

For fifteen years the Social-Democratic leaders have tried to convince the workers that Communism means only the C.P.S.U., that there are no Communists in Western Europe who are leaders of the working class movement, and that the whole of the history and all the traditions of the international working class movement, are embodied in the leadership of the Second International.

Who is inspired nowadays by the names of Vandervelde and Kautsky, Hilferding and the Danish Royal Minister, Stauning? Who gives a thought to the leaders of German Social-Democracy? Where are the

* And when the judges proceeded to the case
One of the Communists stood up,
Stood up with smiling face
And spoke of the day which one day would be
When over the bloodstained five-sixths of the globe. . . .

** This was Comrade Thaelmann's nickname.—Ed.

masses among whom the names of these people arouse enthusiasm for the struggle against fascism, for the downtrodden rights of the working class, won by the sweat and blood of generations of workers?

The catastrophic bankruptcy of these people is the bankruptcy of the policy of Social-Democracy, the bankruptcy of the program of the Second International. By their treachery on August 4, 1914, by their tactics of the "lesser evil" before the advent of the fascist dictatorship, by the whole of their policy during the fifteen years that have elapsed since the war, the Social-Democratic leaders prepared the ground for the unrestricted terror and unbridled chauvinistic agitation of fascism, and even now, as an offset to the "madness of the brave" in Asturias and at the barricades of Vienna, they bring forward the despicable legend about a "counter-revolutionary situation".

The Communist International has hammered out *Dimitroff*, *Thaelmann* and *Rakosi*, *Itikov* (leader of the C.P. of Japan, who gave an example of how a proletarian revolutionary should behave in court, and was sentenced to penal servitude for life), and *Lo-din-Shan* (one of the leaders of the Canton Commune, member of the C.C. of the C.P. of China, behaved in an exceptionally manly fashion, when in court, transforming it into a tribune for the struggle against Japanese imperialism, and the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang, was executed in 1934), developed *proletarian heroism on a mass scale*, and created a phalanx of fearless proletarian revolutionaries who marched to the gallows singing the "International"—*John Scheer* and *Lutgens* in Germany, *Shalai* and *Furst* in Hungary, as well as *Ivata* and *Novo* (members of the C.C. of the C.P. of Japan, tortured in the Japanese police dens), and *Van Kun Lyao*, and *Syn Dzi Mun* (outstanding leaders of the Soviet movement in China who died a gallant death in the heroic struggle against imperialist intervention and Kuomintang counter-revolution).

These iron cadres are invincible, because their strength lies in their *inseparable and organic contacts with the masses*, in their *struggle for socialism*, which is victorious today in the mighty land of the Soviets and tomorrow will unfurl its red banner "over the bloodstained five-sixths of the globe".

George Dimitroff . . . From a young typesetter reading Chernyshevsky's book *What Is To Be Done?* in secret—to Marx, Lenin and Stalin, to the historic tribune at Leipzig. "I am a soldier of the proletarian revolution, I am a soldier of the Communist International and will remain so to my last breath." . . . These words uttered by Dimitroff, who at the Leipzig trial became transformed from accused into the menacing accuser of the German bourgeoisie and fascism, were a signal for the entire working class in Germany, caught unawares by the extent of the fascist terror, to raise the revolutionary struggle anew against fascism.

The Leipzig trial was of tremendous importance in encouraging the Communist Party of Germany and the German workers. We need but call to mind the first open demonstrations against fascism which were called forth by the Leipzig trial, the thousands of workers' letters of greeting to Dimitroff, the thousands of radio-listeners who scattered throughout the whole of proletarian Germany the joyful news of the international campaign against fascism called forth by the trial of Dimitroff, the working class witnesses, tortured by fascist Storm Troopers, who, when in court, looked into the eyes of Dimitroff with the greatest moral satisfaction, bringing down on to their heads the wrath

of the fascist judge who demanded that they should look at him and not at Dimitroff, because Dimitroff "hypnotized them".

The Leipzig trial was a tremendous blow at the prestige of National-Socialism. The devastating personal confrontation with the real incendiary of the Reichstag—the "frantic captain" Herman Goering—and later the verdict of acquittal, meant that the first doubts had crept into the ranks of the uneasy petty bourgeoisie as to who had really set fire to the Reichstag. It was in this already that the first oppositional sentiments found their expression to burst out openly only a year later—on June 30, 1934.

The defeat of fascism at Leipzig was a victory for the entire international proletariat. It was the *starting point for the united development of a wide campaign for the proletarian united front, the protest of the whole of the people against fascism*. A very wide united anti-fascist front came into being without the formal signing of a pact. This united front was cemented by the unforgettable days when Dimitroff made his historic defense. For the whole world, literally the whole world, followed every stage of this dramatic single-handed struggle against fascism with strained attention.

It was the first practical reply to the doctrine of passivity preached by the Social-Democratic leaders under the flag of the "epoch of reaction". *It was a whole stage in the struggle against fascism*. And the very fact that the Leipzig trial was *part of the class front* opened up tremendous possibilities for the mobilization of the masses at home and abroad in defense of Ernst Thaelmann.

Ernst Thaelmann. . . There was probably no leader of any Communist Party in capitalist countries on whom the fury of the bourgeoisie and their Social-Democratic lackeys would have burst so fiercely as on Ernst Thaelmann. For Thaelmann is the German proletariat itself. Everybody has seen how he has become transformed from the leader of the transport workers of Hamburg not only into the leader of the C.P.G. but also into the leader of the *entire working class of Germany*. When Thaelmann spoke at the Third Congress of the Communist International in 1921, on the question of strike tactics, Lenin immediately directed attention to his enormous strike experience. And when Lenin then criticized the German Communist Party for the March rising, Thaelmann did not lose heart, but on the contrary, he immediately *took heart*, and in later years often told his friends that *this was the turning point in the development of his political life*. Ernst Thaelmann is the embodiment of the Bolshevization of the German Communist Party, of the growing fighting capacity of the German working class. His great love for the C.P.S.U., his loyalty to the Communist International, his irreconcilable struggle against deviations, his passionate ideological attacks on Social-Democratic theories that had crept into the Party, constitute a tremendous historical heritage for the Communist Party of Germany, a mighty weapon for its further Bolshevization.

The fact that the German Communist Party has formed mass underground organizations, and is carrying on a heroic struggle against fascism, and now understands its weaknesses which arise primarily from an underestimation of the united front, is also to a considerable degree the result of the whole of the preceding work of Thaelmann, who, while refusing to make any concessions to Social-Democratic theories, always sought to make contacts with the Social-Democratic workers and insistently and systematically inculcated the idea of the united front

in the minds of the Communists. The German workers still remember the 21 questions put to him by the Social-Democratic workers and his reply to them. The entire international proletariat still remembers the speech made by Thaelmann in Paris in connection with the Fifteenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, a speech permeated with a powerful feeling for internationalism and the united proletarian front.

The fascist dictatorship is preparing the trial of Ernst Thaelmann. The fascist cutthroats are subjecting him to cruel tortures. But neither tortures, nor lies, nor forged documents, nor the testimony of the fascist spies—Grabis, Kraus and Lass—can shake the iron determination of the leader of proletarian Germany. These efforts are doomed to produce a similarly miserable fiasco as the trial of George Dimitroff in Leipzig.

Matthias Rakosi. . . After ten years of torture in the clutches of the Budapest secret police, he displayed his old courage in the speech he delivered before the court, in which he indicted the fascist "patriots" who betrayed military plans to the Roumanian interventionists against Soviet Hungary. Always the same heroic defense of the proletarian dictatorship and of all the measures it took.

Such are Comintern people. They have arisen from the midst of the working class. They were engendered by the epoch of great class battles and mass proletarian heroism. They were and are inspired by the mighty example of the Bolshevik cohorts of Lenin and Stalin, by faith in the revolutionary, fighting powers of the masses and a mighty confidence in the approach of the victory of the proletarian cause throughout the world. "Hurry and cut off my head", declared the rank-and-file Communist Fiete Shulz, a few days ago in the fascist court of Hamburg, "otherwise Communism will be here before you have time to look around . . ." In these innumerable examples of mass proletarian heroism we lose sight of the isolated helpless figures like Ernst Torgler, petty bourgeois who have by chance found their way into the working class movement, who are thrown into a palsy of fear by the gown of a fascist judge, the personification of "law and order", and for whom the highest good is their own petty-bourgeois well-being.

Two years of fascist dictatorship have passed in Germany. During this period it has succeeded in dealing a number of hard blows at the German working class. It has deprived the workers of the last vestiges of political rights, and has converted the youth of the working class into the bondmen and serfs of German capitalism and the fascist State, even depriving them of the right of labor and to move freely from place to place. But National-Socialism has not succeeded in destroying the Communist Party, in breaking the iron steadfastness of its leaders, in destroying the will of the toiling masses to offer resistance, and consequently has proved incapable of ensuring a capitalist way out of the crisis for the German bourgeoisie and a new era of prosperity for German capitalism.

The example of the great struggle carried on by Dimitroff, Thaelmann, Rakosi, Scheer, Lutgens and all the innumerable heroes in the army of international Communism, must inspire the Communists of the whole world and the working class of the whole world, to bring about as quickly as possible the united front for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, and directed against the new military gambles of imperialism, and the capitalist offensive. It must inspire all the toilers, all

honest opponents of fascist barbarism, to join the mighty anti-fascist front of all the people—

For the liberation of Thaelmann,

For the liberation of Rakosi,

For the liberation of all the prisoners of fascism.

Let everyone remember the first words uttered by George Dimitroff as he stepped out of the fascist airplane at the Moscow airdrome:

"Anti-fascist public opinion should not be satisfied. . . . The struggle for the liberation of the leader of the German revolutionary workers—Thaelmann—the struggle for the liberation of the other prisoners of fascism . . . is a matter of honor for the international anti-fascist movement."

The struggle against fascism is a hard one. But it provides the fullest confidence in victory, demanding that all the efforts of the united front of the working class and of the entire anti-fascist movement be strained, that a correct Bolshevik policy be pursued, and that Bolshevik reliability and discipline be maintained.

These Comintern people set us an example of this iron self-restraint and discipline. Only the Communist International could bring forward such people. And only under the leadership of the Communist International is a new and free life for the toilers being built on the ruins of decayed capitalism and its loathsome fascist regime.

New Fabrications by the Enemies of the Unity of the Trade Union Movement

By A. LOSOVSKY

THE appeal made by the Executive Bureau of the Profintern to the Congress of the Norwegian trade unions has called forth the dissatisfaction and wrath of the orthodox Amsterdamites and other enemies of the united front and of the unity of the trade-union movement. Since it is difficult to appear before the workers and to prove to them that the unity of the trade union movement is a harmful thing, all kinds of fantastic inventions are set going, facts are distorted and documents falsified. In this connection, all records have been broken by the Swedish reformist trade-union newspapers which have printed an article written by a certain "participant at an extraordinary conference of the Profintern" which allegedly took place in Moscow in September, 1934.

From the outset I must upset the Amsterdamites by stating that no conference of the Profintern, either ordinary or extraordinary, was held in Moscow in September, 1934. Hence it is not clear where this participant at this alleged conference has come from. The Swedish reformists have performed a trick which is usual for bourgeois newspapers; that is, they gave one of their employees the task of writing an article, baptized this person as a "participant at the Moscow conference" and published in the press a whole collection of thin and rotten inventions made by this "eye-witness". The international reformist press, including the *Berner Tagwacht*, seized hold of these inventions, in which the wish is put forward as the reality.

Well, what did this "eye-witness" learn and what did he hear? He learned, at the conference which never took place, that "the policy of the Profintern, the Red Trade Unions and the Red Trade Union Opposition has turned out to be bankrupt in all countries", that "the Red Trade Unions and the Red Trade Union Opposition are being disbanded", and that "as far back as the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the hopeless collapse of the Red Trade Unions was placed on record", etc. The "eye-witness" concludes these inventions of his by arguments about "the complete bankruptcy of the policy of the Red International of Trade Unions in those countries where fascism has succeeded in coming to power".

This "participant at the Moscow Conference" declares that "neither in Germany nor in Austria has it been possible to re-establish a single free trade union", that "the Profintern has taken careful measures not to allow a single Social-Democrat to be admitted to the leadership of the independent class trade unions", that "the Profintern is dragging at the tail of events" and that "disruptive work is being carried on in the free trade unions, on the instructions of the Profintern", etc.

It might have been possible to leave matters there, for the reformist press has repeated this sort of thing dozens of times, and there is nothing new in these arguments, were it not for the conclusions drawn from this

article, conclusions, in actual fact, to obtain which this extraordinary conference and the "eye-witness" himself were invented.

"The unification between the C.G.T. and the C.G.T.U. [the reformist trade-union federation and the revolutionary trade-union federation—*Ed.*] which has been achieved in France [this unification is far from having been achieved—*A.L.*] the unification of the Amsterdam and Red Trade Unions was the first step on the road to the re-establishment of a united trade-union international.

"The next weeks and months will show how seriously the Communists regard the establishment of trade-union unity, and *whether they are prepared to disband the Red Trade Union Opposition groups and the Red Trade Unions which still exist in other countries, and thereby also liquidate the Red International of Trade Unions.*" (My emphasis—*A.L.*)

Herein lies the whole point of this article. The Swedish "eye-witness" repeats in his own way all that the Central Council of the Amsterdam International stated at Weymouth, namely, that all the revolutionary trade unions, including the Profintern, must be disbanded if the unity of the trade-union movement is to be brought about.

TRADE UNION UNITY EXPERIENCES IN FRANCE

It only requires a little thought as regards the idea behind and the consequence of this proposal to understand the whole anti-working-class essence of such "methods" of re-establishing the split trade-union movement. Let us look at the actual position which has now arisen in France. The revolutionary trade unions propose unity from top to bottom. Certain trade unions, affiliated to the reformist General Confederation of Labor (C.G.T.) are also declaring in favor of unity. The leaders of the C.G.T. and the leaders of the biggest reformist trade-union federations (railwaymen, miners, textile workers) are declaring against it. On this basis a very serious struggle is going on within the reformist Confederation of Labor. The struggle is becoming all the sharper insofar as a number of local and even regional and national unions are declaring seriously for the establishment of unity, not by liquidating the Red Trade Unions, but by fusing the corresponding parallel unions (of the C.G.T. and the C.G.T.U.—*Ed.*) on the basis of the trade-union democracy. Two hundred and seventy-five united trade unions have already come into existence in France. Certain trade-union federations have already fused on certain of the railroads. The National Union of Teachers and the Federation of Municipal Employees, etc., have declared in favor of fusion.

Why have a number of reformist trade unions declared in favor of fusion? Because not only the masses of members, but also a certain section of the reformist trade union officials know that the revolutionary trade unions and the revolutionary workers were always in the front ranks of the struggle for the interests of the working class, and have become convinced that the introduction of a revolutionary spirit and of revolutionary methods of struggle—as a result of the fusion of the reformist and the revolutionary trade unions—will strengthen the working class in its struggle against the capitalists.

What would it imply, in the conditions existing in France, if the Red Trade Unions were to be disbanded and liquidated? It would imply that the revolutionary positions won by the international proletariat

would have to be given up, that the revolutionary energy concentrated in the revolutionary trade unions, the experience of struggle accumulated over many years of struggle against the capitalists, and the revolutionary creative power and fighting spirit with which the revolutionary workers are imbued, would all be scattered, and every worker—without interesting himself in the question of what policy the given trade union will carry on—a policy of class struggle or one of class collaboration—would individually enter one or other reformist trade union.

What would this give the French proletariat? Would this strengthen their position? Would it not be of advantage to the bourgeoisie to disband the revolutionary organizations? On what grounds must the revolutionary workers give up their organization? Have their tactics proved to be incorrect? Has not their analysis of the situation been confirmed wholly and completely? The Profintern and its Sections are displaying the greatest energy and sharpness in raising the question of trade-union unity, and have intensified the struggle for trade-union unity not because facts have allegedly proved the weakness of the policy of the Comintern and the Red Trade Unions, as the Amsterdamites lyingly assert, but because a new situation has arisen, which is also urging the reformist workers to take the path of the class struggle, which is increasing their leaning towards a united front with the revolutionary workers, a situation which ensures the success of the militant tactics of the revolutionary trade-union opposition.

TO DISBAND OR FUSE?

It is one thing to disband and liquidate the revolutionary trade unions, but it is another thing if two parallel trade unions—reformist and revolutionary—fuse, and organize a joint congress on the basis of proportional representation, elect leaders on this basis, and establish a united trade union on the basis of developed proletarian democracy and the class struggle, and fortify the united front between all workers with a view to carrying on the struggle against the capitalists. Such a unification raises the fighting power of the workers, gives them new means whereby to defend the rights they already have and to achieve new rights, whereas simply to disband a trade-union organization, to liquidate it and to scatter the masses of its members will only be of service to our class enemies. This is why the *demand made by the leaders of the Amsterdam International that the revolutionary unions be disbanded must be categorically rejected.*

This does not mean that in certain cases we cannot ourselves liquidate one or another small union, whose existence we would not consider advisable from the point of view of the development of the struggle of the broadest masses. But this has nothing in common with the slogan that the revolutionary unions must be liquidated; it has nothing in common with the dream of the leaders of the Amsterdam International that an end must be put to the revolutionary trade-union movement at all costs.

The author of the lying article in the *Berner Tagwacht* asserts that "the Profintern is dragging at the tail of events", as regards Germany and Austria. Let us examine the facts. Who stood at the head of the free trade unions in Germany and Austria? The friends and colleagues of the Swedish reformists, the leaders of the Amsterdam International. What did they do to struggle against fascism? Why, even a section of the Social-Democratic press was compelled to subject the conduct of the

leaders of the German trade unions to criticism, and even Vandervelde, Mertens, and Friedrich Adler were compelled to upbraid their German friends for the fact that they capitulated.

LESSONS OF GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

Can anybody deny that the leaders of the German reformist trade unions gave up all their positions without a fight, that they offered their services to Hitler, and that they were prepared to continue their work under the political leadership of German fascism? No, nobody can deny this! These are facts which have cost the working class of Germany very dear.

Can anybody deny that while the Austrian workers were engaged in an armed struggle against the onslaught of fascism, the leaders of the trade unions not only did not stand at the head of this struggle but disrupted the general strike and the strike of the railway workers? No, nobody can. These are facts about which no single class-conscious Austrian worker can speak without being furious.

What did the policy of class collaboration and the "peaceful" tactics of the leaders of the reformist trade unions in Germany and Austria lead to? They led to the trade unions being smashed up and to the victory of fascism. But who in these countries fought against the tactics of capitulation, who called the workers to struggle, who called on them to organize strikes and to undertake an armed struggle against fascism? The Communists and the supporters of the Profintern. In these countries the Social-Democrats had the support of the majority of the workers (in Austria of the overwhelming majority of the workers); from year to year they carried on a policy of class collaboration and carried on a constant and uninterrupted struggle against the united front, and therefore fascism was victorious.

Well, and after the fascist dictatorship was established? The day after the fascist dictatorship was established in Germany, the Communists issued the slogan that the rank-and-file organizations of the free trade unions must be preserved at all costs, and that *independent class trade unions must be set up, in conjunction with the Social-Democratic workers and functionaries, i.e., that a struggle must be carried on so that the re-established free trade unions should be independent of fascism and carry on the class struggle*. When we saw that certain of our comrades were incorrectly counterposing the independent trade unions to the free trade unions, we drew their attention to this, and made the open declaration that *we are fighting in Germany to re-establish the free trade unions*. We are fighting to re-establish the mass working-class organizations which have historically been built up in Germany so that they become really free from the bourgeoisie and bourgeois ideology. We desire not only to re-establish the free trade unions but to bring about a situation where these trade unions are class, fighting unions, and that they are headed by firm proletarians and not by incorrigible capitulators, by people of the type of Leipart, Tarnov and Grassman who have brought the working class of Germany to such heavy suffering.

As soon as the armed struggle in Austria came to an end, and the government disbanded the free trade unions, the Communists and the supporters of the Profintern issued the slogan of the struggle to re-establish the free trade unions. Our Swedish "eye-witness" asserts

that "it has not been possible to re-establish a single free trade union either in Germany or Austria". This is a lie! Let the Swedish reformists ask their friend Otto Bauer, and he will tell them that the Communists have succeeded, in conjunction with Social-Democratic officials, in re-establishing quite a big number of free trade unions. The "central commission to re-establish the free trade unions", set up by the Communists and local officials of the free trade unions, has done tremendous work, and now has about 14,000 members in the illegal free trade unions united by the central commission. What are the former leaders of the free trade unions doing in this situation? Instead of supporting the work being done, and strengthening the unity of the free trade unions set up with such difficulties, they have taken the path of splitting the unions. Shorsh and other trade union emigrants have created a "central committee of revolutionary free trade unions" in order to disrupt the work done without their aid.

Who is fighting for unity and who is splitting the trade unions? There is not the slightest doubt that Shorsh has done this not without knowledge, but with the energetic support of the leaders of the Amsterdam International. Who is splitting the trade unions? Who is undermining the unity of the workers? What must be done by the workers who are re-establishing the free trade unions in Austria under most difficult conditions? Hand these trade unions over to Citizen Shorsh, hereditary perpetual leader and annointed by God? The workers cannot hand over the leadership of their trade unions to those who led them to defeat. And if Shorsh and Co. have taken the path leading to a split, the worse for them. Will not the Swedish "eye-witness" and the Amsterdam International which stands behind him, give instructions to liquidate the Austrian and German free trade unions set up in the name of the "unity of the trade union movement"?

* * *

If the example of France, Austria and Germany shows how harmful for the working-class movement is the slogan of the liquidation of the class trade unions, advanced by the reformist leaders, then still more clearly evident are the harm and absurdity of the Amsterdam slogan that the Profintern should be liquidated. We do not doubt that the Amsterdam International would not be above liquidating the international center of the revolutionary trade-union movement. We do not doubt that such a liquidation of the international center of the revolutionary trade-union movement would cause great satisfaction to the leaders of the Amsterdam International. But what grounds are there for adopting such proposals? What would they give to the working class? Can the members of the reformist trade unions assert that the Amsterdam International is an international fighting organization?

THE AMSTERDAM INTERNATIONAL

Formally, of course, the Amsterdam International is an international organization, for it has statutes, an executive committee, it issues a bulletin, it has its press, and calls congresses, etc. But any kind of international organization abounds in these things, whether it is a stamp-collecting society, whether it is a church music lovers' society, or anything else of that kind. But we are within our rights in demanding something more, something greater, of a workers' international than from all kinds of voluntary international societies and organizations. From a workers' international we demand first and foremost that it

should carry on a constant and systematic struggle for the immediate interests of the working class, that it should organize the class struggle against the whole of the capitalist system; that this international should carry on the struggle against those of its members who replace the class struggle by class collaboration, and who betray the interests of the masses of workers. We are within our rights in demanding of a workers' international that the interests of the workers of a single country should be subordinated to the interests of the entire international proletariat, that this international should carry on a really practical struggle against fascism, and that it should carry on a constant and unswerving struggle against war.

If we look at the Amsterdam International from this angle, then can we call it a really proletarian international? No, we cannot, because it declares openly against the class struggle, and is in favor of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, because it has not only not taken any measures to condemn sharply the leaders of the free trade unions in Germany and Austria, who betrayed the working masses in the eyes of the whole world, but supported these leaders and declared its solidarity with their policy. This international has not expelled from its ranks those individuals who led the working class of Germany and Austria to defeat, thereby indicating its solidarity with them, and support and justification of their policy. What is more, the entire policy of the Amsterdam International is directed towards making the policy and tactics pursued by the Austro-German trade unions an example for all countries.

We are within our rights, therefore, in asking the following question: What guarantees have the workers in England, Sweden, Denmark, Czechoslovakia and Poland, that the leaders of their trade unions, who maintain the same political position as did their Austro-German colleagues, will not lead the working class in these various countries along the German path?

LIQUIDATE THE PROFINTERN?

What would happen if we were to accept the proposal made by the Amsterdamites, and were to liquidate the Profintern? Who would gain from this act? The workers? No! They would lose, because the Profintern has, over a period of 15 years, done all in its power to support the workers in all countries in their struggle. It is the bourgeoisie who would gain, the bourgeoisie which would be rid of a hostile and anti-capitalist revolutionary organization. So then, for what purpose have we to liquidate the Profintern? The leaders of the Amsterdam International say that we must do this so as to bring about the unity of the trade-union movement. But why must unity be established on the basis of the liquidation of the revolutionary international? Unity cannot arise out of the liquidation of the Profintern. The result of such a step will not be unity but simply capitulation to the policy and tactics of the reformists. The reformists demand the liquidation of the revolutionary trade unions and of the Profintern so that they may continue their policy unhindered and without penalty. But this policy has gone bankrupt! It has led the working class of Germany and Austria to defeat. So that, the whole point of the proposals regarding the liquidation of the Profintern emanating from the leaders of the Amsterdam International may be reduced to the following: *Don't prevent us from leading the working class along the Austro-German path.* Such are the hidden motives of this international chatter about liquidating the revo-

lutionary trade unions and the Profintern, which is being published in the entire reformist press.

The Amsterdamites have two further arguments in reserve, namely: (1) The Communists, they allege, split the trade unions, and therefore they must disband their organizations; (2) the reformist trade-union organizations are very old organizations, and the Social-Democrats are historically the only inheritors of the best traditions of the working-class movement. Let us examine these "arguments" as well. The split in the working-class movement along political and trade-union lines began fundamentally at the beginning of the war. Can it be said that the war policy of the German, Austrian and French trade unions corresponded to the traditions of the working-class movement in these countries?

The historians and politicians of the trade-union movement in these countries express their views on this theme unwillingly. Where and when did the congresses of the Socialist International declare that the slogan, "Proletarians of all lands, unite!" should be replaced by the slogan, "Proletarians of all lands, slaughter one another!" Where and when did the international congresses or national congresses of the free trade unions decide that the workers must unite with the bourgeoisie of their respective countries, and that they must reject the class struggle and pass over to class collaboration? Such decisions were made, but only at the congresses of the Catholic and yellow trade unions. The trade unions which were affiliated to the pre-war trade union international did not make an official declaration in favor of class collaboration.

Even if the policy of class collaboration carried through by the leaders of the trade unions had been limited to the war alone, then that would have had to introduce a deep split into the working-class movement, but this war policy was continued in the post-war period as well. The class struggle has been systematically driven out of the reformist trade unions. Revolutionary workers and entire organizations which have declared against class collaboration and have acted against the rejection of the best traditions of the working-class movement, have been systematically expelled, in spite of the most elementary rules of trade-union democracy. Thus, the revolutionary workers were obliged, in order to defend the direct and ultimate aims of the working-class movement, to be up in arms against those who dragged the working-class organizations into the bog of class collaboration, and to rally and unite all those who stood in defense of the principles and practice of the class struggle, for to reject the class struggle is to transform the working class into an appendage of monopolist capital. Where, then, lies the cause of the split in the working-class movement? *The basic reason for the split in the working-class movement is pre-war opportunism, and the social-imperialist policy and the post-war class collaboration carried on by international Social-Democracy and the leaders of the reformist trade unions.*

Anybody who does not understand or who does not wish to understand the cause of the split, may cry "unity, unity"! from morning to night, but no sense will come of it.

The legitimist argument is still less convincing than the attempt to throw the responsibility for the split onto the revolutionary workers. That the reformist trade unions are very old organizations is, on the whole, true. But age does not decide anything in such cases. What we need to ask ourselves is, why is it that a whole number of old trade-

union organizations have turned out to be outside the ranks of the Amsterdam International, and why is it that the young trade-union movements of the U.S.S.R., China and of a number of other countries have created a new trade-union international?

The answer is, because the Amsterdam International, re-established in July, 1919, sanctified the military-imperialist policy of 1914 to 1918, because this international carried on an uninterrupted struggle against the October Revolution, and against the Party and the trade unions which carried on a struggle against the whole capitalist world; because the Amsterdam International not only did not raise a finger to help the workers of the colonies in their struggle against imperialism, but, on the contrary, assisted imperialism to grind down the colonial peoples. Of what importance, then, is the age of the organization in such circumstances? What the workers are interested in is the *policy* which the trade unions are operating. That is why a silly impression is created by the talk of the reformist leaders of the C.G.T. of France about "come back to the old home", at a time when the workers of France are faced with the problem as to how to establish a united and strong trade union organization, as to how to establish a powerful fortress for the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

From whichever angle you approach it, from the historical, political, or organizational angle, there are no serious arguments in favor of liquidating the revolutionary trade-union movement, while there are thousands and thousands of arguments in favor of uniting the trade unions on the basis of the class struggle.

THE PARTY AND TRADE UNIONS

In their search for arguments against the unity of the trade-union movement, not only do they set into operation all kinds of "eye-witnesses", but they juggle with facts, and falsify documents. This operation has been performed by the assistant secretary of the Amsterdam International, Schtoltz, who has occupied himself in making historical investigations in respect to the statutes of the Profintern. Mr. Schtoltz asserts that "the trade unions and the Party are one and the same thing to the Communists". It is true that this assertion is at loggerheads with facts, but evidently all the worse for the facts!

Let us take two or three countries, and we shall see that such an assertion has nothing in common with the truth. In the U.S.S.R., the Communist Party has about three million members, whereas the trade unions have 19,000,000 members. Can we say that the trade unions and the Party are one and the same thing? In France there are about 50,000 members in the Party, whereas the Unitary Trade Unions (revolutionary—*Ed.*) have about 300,000 members. Can it be said that the Party and the trade unions are one and the same thing? We could quote dozens more of examples, but these are sufficient to show the whole superficial nature of such kinds of arguments. Organizationally, the trade unions and the Party are not one and the same thing.

But perhaps the trade unions and the Party are one and the same thing politically? Such an assertion would also be incorrect. The Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions have one and the same end in view. But they are different organizations, which have their own special tasks, and forms and methods of struggle.

But perhaps this is not the point, but that the revolutionary trade

unions are led by Communists? I do not know what essence the author embodied in his assertion, but it is a fact that the revolutionary trade unions are in the majority led by Communists, just as the reformist unions are in the majority led by Social-Democrats. Why may this Social-Democrat stand at the head of a trade union, and a Communist not do so? Why may the Social-Democratic Party and the free trade unions act together, and the revolutionary trade unions and the Communist Party not do so?

Or perhaps the Social-Democrats who stand at the head of the trade unions are not Social-Democrats, not members of their party? Hitherto we have known quite the opposite. The leaders of the Swedish trade unions have been and are now members of the Social-Democratic Party. The leaders of the reformist C.G.T. in France are members of the Socialist Party, while some of them are members of the Neo-Socialist Party.* The leaders of the trade unions in England are members of the Labor Party, and so on. But why may not the leaders of the revolutionary trade unions and other trade unions be members of the Communist Party? The revolutionary workers will not ask the reformists whether they should join the Communist Party or not. This is not the business of the reformists, this is our business and let the reformists put this in their pipe and smoke it, once and for all.

The second circumstance discovered by Mr. Schtoltz has been very simply formulated by him. The statutes of the Profintern make provisions for contacts with the Communist International, and the Profintern is allegedly a Section of the Communist International.

Had Citizen Schtoltz set himself the task of clearing up the truth, and not of falsifying documents, he might very easily have established the fact that the Profintern is not a Section of the Communist International. There are the decisions of the Second Congress of the Profintern and the Comintern in this connection. But what in actual fact is the situation? Joint action is undertaken by the Comintern and the Profintern on various questions. Schtoltz considers that such kind of mutual relations are to be condemned. But why may the Amsterdam International act jointly with the Socialist International? Why is it that the bureau of the Amsterdam International often holds sessions together with the bureau of the Socialist International, and whence has Mr. Schtoltz taken the idea that the revolutionary workers will allow anybody to forbid them to display their political views, and to ask the Amsterdamites whether they may join the Communist Party? Let it be borne in mind that the individuals who stand at the head of the Amsterdam International take the liberty of being members at the same time of the Social-Democratic Party and the Second International. Why, then, do these Social-Democrats imagine that the workers will agree to a situation where a united trade-union organization should be composed of citizens who have full rights (Social-Democrats), and the citizens without full rights (the Communists). No, gentlemen, you will not get away with this!

Whether the Amsterdamites are satisfied or not we shall continue in the future to act jointly with the Communist International, to organize all kinds of campaigns along with them, and to support all actions by the Communist International, directed towards the defense of the immediate interests of the working masses, and we shall support

* Neo-Socialists—a fascist break-away from the French Socialist Party, led by Renaudel, etc.—Ed.

the struggle carried on by the Communist International for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Mr. Scholtz does not like this. We are very little disturbed by this. We revolutionary proletarians like this, and we shall continue to carry on in this way. Mr. Scholtz does not like the fact that the statutes of the Profintern advance the demand for a struggle against conciliation with the bourgeoisie, and are against the idea of business collaboration between the classes and social peace. It is not surprising that he does not like this, for collaboration with the bourgeoisie, as well as active co-operation with the latter and social peace, are the foundations of the program of the Amsterdam International. No, we do not propose to change the fundamental principles of our International, we do not propose to hack away the foundations on which our International is built.

In his anxiety about the well-being of the Profintern, and about adapting its statutes to the new situation, Mr. Scholtz writes further as follows:

"The Profintern is directly responsible for the things done and acts committed by the countries and groups affiliated to it. Either the Profintern must alter its statutes, and from the formal point of view must endorse the line carried through by its French Section, or, if this Section advances its proposals seriously, it must recognize that the principles of its International have lost their weight as far as it is concerned. There is no third possibility."

Imagine that there is a third possibility. This is a possibility which Mr. Scholtz has least of all foreseen. The tactics pursued by our C.G.T.U., and its proposals regarding unity do not in the least degree contradict either the statutes or the principles of the Profintern. The Profintern wholly and completely supports its French Section, for the unification of the trade unions on the basis of the class struggle can only increase the fighting power of the French proletariat. Why? Because the Profintern, from the very first days of its existence, has stood for the united front and for the unity of the trade-union movement in each separate country, and on an international scale. Hundreds of documents exist in this connection, which Mr. Scholtz, with his love for historical investigation, may very easily seek out. But the following question arises: Why is it that this assistant secretary of the Amsterdam International has all of a sudden taken to historical investigation and to the study of our statutes? The answer is a very simple one, and can be found at the end of the article where Mr. Scholtz makes the following declaration:

"As regards the statutes of the International Federation of Trade Unions, they have completely preserved their force up to date, because they contain nothing which even in the slightest degree contradicts its policy, and also the latest line of the Profintern in the sphere of the struggle for democracy, freedom and the independence of the trade unions."

Although this statement is a very cunning one, it is sufficiently clear. The point to it is a very simple one, namely, that the practical activity of the Profintern has allegedly come into contradiction with the principles on which its statutes were built up. The statutes, then, of the Profintern must be thrown overboard. The practical activity of the Amsterdam International, on the other hand, does not contradict

its principles, and its statutes preserve their full weight. Hence, the Profintern must reject its own statutes, and adopt those of the Amsterdam International, and in this connection put an end to its existence.

The picture would not be complete if we did not refer to the statements made by other leaders of the Amsterdam International. During his presence at the Norwegian Trades Union Congress, Chevenel, the General Secretary of the Amsterdam International, gave his impressions to the correspondent of the central newspaper of the Norwegian Labor Party, the *Arbeiter-Bladet*.

Chevenel considers that "the international trade-union movement has good prospects". To prove this he let himself go on a journey beyond the seas, and declared that the Amsterdam International has contacts with the trade-union movements in America, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, India, Chile, Argentine, and Brazil, etc.

Chevenel not only made no statement as to the character of these contacts—evidently so as not to spoil the joyous perspectives indicated by him—but "forgot" to make any statement as to the state of things with regard to the free trade unions in Germany and Austria. It has remained a secret as to whether the Amsterdam International supports the re-established free trade unions in Germany and Austria, or not. Chevenel preferred to speak in great detail about the Storm and Defense Detachments, about the situation in the National-Socialist Party, but he did not have enough time to make any statement as to the state of affairs in the German and Austrian trade-union movement. Replying to a question as to the attitude of the Amsterdam International to the united front, Chevenel replied that: "We regard it as a maneuver." As regards the unity of the trade-union movement, this is not, according to him, an international problem at all, for "the trades-union movement is split in only one country, namely in France".

And so "the new and kindly" secretary of the Amsterdam International makes the assertion that the trade-union movement is united throughout the whole world. We are within our rights in demanding of the secretary of an international organization a little more information about the state of things. But we shall not interfere in his personal business, but shall take a look as to what is taking place in reality.

Apart from France, parallel revolutionary and reformist trade unions exist in Spain, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Austria, Germany, Italy, Japan, U.S.A., Chile, Brazil, Argentine, Cuba, Uruguay, Canada, China, Philippines, etc. In a number of countries (China, Italy, Cuba, Chile, etc.), the revolutionary trade unions are far stronger than the reformist unions, while in the other countries the reformist unions are stronger than the revolutionary unions. There are a number of countries where the revolutionary trade unions were dispersed (and all their property handed over to the reformist unions [Finland and Yugoslavia]). To make the assertion, under such circumstances, that with the exception of France the trade-union movement is united throughout the whole world, is, to say the least of it, to certify one's own ignorance.

But Chevenel none the less displayed a certain knowledge of geography when he called to mind the existence of the trade unions in the U.S.S.R. And the key he has to this question is as follows:

"On an international scale unity can only consist of the Russian trade unions affiliating to the Amsterdam International."

In such cases the French say "C'est simple comme bonjour"! ("As simple as saying how do you do"). Mr. Chevenel "forgets" that the trade unions in the U.S.S.R. have two and a half times more members than there are in the whole of the Amsterdam International, and that the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. are unions functioning in a country where the proletarian revolution has been victorious. He forgets that to have carried into life the program and tactics of the Amsterdam International in the U.S.S.R. would have meant the restoration of capitalism and the advent to power of black counter-revolution. In addition, Mr. Chevenel proposes that the Comintern should reject its own policy, and "put an end to its sabotage of and activity against the trade-union movement", and then, he alleges, real unity will be brought about.

If we add the foul lies published in the Norwegian paper, the *Medelelsblat*, by Chevenel's colleagues who declare that "the Communists have already brought about unity and unification with the National-Socialists and fascists", then we will understand in what direction Messrs. the Amsterdamites, are dragging the international trade-union movement.

How are we to explain such a line of thought in the minds of the leading officials of the Amsterdam International? We must explain it by the fact that they do not wish to recognize the causes which led to the destruction of the German and Austrian trade unions. Chevenel is kind enough to allow the Soviet trade unions to affiliate to the Amsterdam International. This, of course, is stupendous liberalism on his part. Chevenel would have done better had he done a little thinking prior to giving the interview, and then he would have come to the conclusion that the problem of the unity of the trade-union movement, even if there were no longer any revolutionary trade unions outside of the U.S.S.R., could not be solved simply by affiliation to the Amsterdam International.

One of my opponents has been very much upset with me at the statement I made that "Communism means victory, while reformism means defeat". My assertion was based on the experience of 17 years of struggle waged by the C.P.S.U., and the revolutionary trade unions in the U.S.S.R., and on the basis of 16 years of struggle by German Social-Democracy and the German trade unions. If my opponent is dissatisfied, let him show us where and when reformism has brought victory to the working class. He can hardly base his case on the Labor governments in England and on the Social-Democratic governments in Sweden and Denmark. There were such governments in Germany and Austria, and everybody knows how things ended there.

Thus, both the Swedish "eye-witness" and the Amsterdam secretaries, Scholtz and Chevenel, are driving at the one point which amounts to the following: "Disband the Red trade unions, liquidate the Profintern and then a united trade-union movement will be re-established on the basis of the principles and tactics of the statutes of the Amsterdam International."

The fact that the Amsterdamites are beginning to repeat these proposals of theirs more and more frequently, does not make them any more convincing and acceptable. The unity of the trade-union movement is being hammered out in the ranks of the working class in spite of the leaders of the Amsterdam International. It is being hammered out in the joint struggle of the workers against the capitalist offensive, and against fascism and war. It is being hammered out at joint conferences and congresses, where the delegates define their policy and

tactics. We are prepared to re-establish the unity of the trade-union movement on a national and international scale, in spite of the lies and inventions of the enemies of the revolutionary trade-union movement. We have displayed our will for unity in France. The Amsterdamites displayed their will to split the movement, at Weymouth, in the speeches made by the leaders of the reformist trade-union movement. But we are not losing heart, we are convinced that the will of the masses for unity will overcome all obstacles.

And there are still many obstacles in the way. Above all, the entire bourgeoisie is against the re-establishment of the unity of the split trade-union movement in a solid front. Why? Because a united trade-union movement on the basis of the class struggle implies a rallying of the forces of the working class, and this is something which is necessary now more than ever. Who must bear the burden of the crisis, the bourgeoisie or the toiling masses—this is the problem which stands out sharply in all countries. The bourgeoisie have hitherto been able, by exerting and concentrating all their forces and thanks to the split in the trade-union movement, to place the whole burden of the crisis on the backs of the toiling masses. Every day brings ever new misery for the working class, fascism runs rife in a number of countries, and a new imperialist war is advancing on toiling mankind. Anyone who acts against the rallying of the workers' forces, against the unity of the trade-union movement, is the worst enemy of the working class, whatever his subjective intentions may be. This is why the sharpest struggle must be directed against those leaders of the reformist trade unions who seek out thousands of arguments in order to disrupt the will of the masses for the united front, for the unity of the trade-union movement.

We know that the unity of the trade-union movement is of advantage to the working class and, therefore, will be victorious. But we also know that the unity of the trade-union movement is being built up, and can be built up and be of use to the working class only when it is built up on the basis of the class struggle. This is the kind of unity for which we have been fighting since 1920, and this is the kind of unity of the trade-union movement for which we will fight to the end.

The Communist Party of France in the Struggle for the United Front

By MAURICE THOREZ

PART II *

THE Socialist Party, making use of the renegade and counter-revolutionary degenerate Doriot (who, as we know, hobnobs with Trotsky and uses many of the anti-Soviet arguments of the Trotskyites), places all possible stumbling blocks in the path of the united front. At the present time the sharpest questions are those of the program of the united front of the people and organic unity. Let us examine the essence of these questions. But first let us speak of our struggle for the *proletarian leadership of the anti-fascist struggle of the middle classes.*

Is it true that the middle classes can only follow the Doumergues and Tardieus? Is it true that people in a small way have to be enslaved and downtrodden by big capital on the pretext of liberation from slavery and terror? We think that it is possible for the middle classes to engage in struggle alongside the proletariat, even for those who do not as yet want Communism, and who are not yet disposed to struggle for Soviet Power. We shall not cease to claim and prove that the only way out of the crisis is the struggle for Soviet Power. We do not want to weaken but, on the contrary, to intensify our agitation and propaganda in favor of the basic program of our Communist Party, in favor of preparations being made for the armed uprising of the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only way of putting an end, once and for all, to the anarchy of the capitalist system, the terrible distress of the masses, to fascism and the terrible menace of war.

We want to subordinate all our work to this aim. And we think that we shall not get further away from our aim, but, on the contrary, we shall draw nearer to it if we direct all our efforts in the spirit of the decisions of the national conference of the C.P. of France against the danger of fascism, and prevent the victory of fascism in France.

In order to defeat fascism we must create, under the leadership of the proletariat, the widest possible front of all toilers, and oppressed, of all those who have been hit by the crisis and who are in danger of ruin and pauperization. We must act in such a way that the anti-fascist front of the working class and the middle classes organized throughout the country will begin to act on the basis of a program of demands corresponding to the immediate needs of the toiling masses.

The struggle of the masses can lead to the just demands of the toilers being fulfilled.

Consequently, we must first of all draw up a list of the demands of the masses of the people. We have finished a draft which we have presented to the Socialist Party.

In the most prominent place, of course, we put the demands of the working class, demands dealing with the wages of the workers engaged in industry, the wages of railwaymen, office employees and civil servants. We demand the withdrawal of the emergency decrees, the introduction of the 40-hour week without reduction of wages, an amnesty for and

* Concluded from No. 5, March 5, 1935.

the reinstatement of all people dismissed from their work for participation in strikes, the institution of workers' delegates to see to the introduction of safety devices in all factories.

For the unemployed we demand the compulsory registration of all unemployed, the right of all the unemployed to receive relief, the establishment of unemployment funds in all the municipalities. This is an important part of the program, if we take into account the growth of unemployment (compared with last year the number of unemployed entitled to receive relief, *i.e.*, of those subject to registration, has increased by 100,000).

As far as the peasants are concerned, we demand the payment of crisis relief to the small and middle peasants, especially to those who suffer from low prices, we demand the introduction of insurance against agricultural calamities and the revising of the contract law; we demand new rules for the payment of sharecroppers, ensuring them two-thirds of the harvest.

For small traders and handicraftsmen we demand a moratorium on debts, the revision of contracts and the conditions for handing over trading premises.

We struggle against the forced sale of the property of small traders, handicraftsmen and also of the poor peasants.

For house-tenants we demand the revision of the rent law, and a moratorium on house rents for the unemployed.

For those people living in the miserable, ill-arranged little hovels on the outskirts and who are severely exploited by land speculators and syndicates, we demand a moratorium on their payments on the land and the houses.

We raise with all our power the demands of the war veterans, especially the following two points: The maintenance of rights which have been won, and the repeal of the emergency laws directed against the ex-servicemen.

We want social legislation which protects the toilers. We want the abolition of the emergency decrees, the revision of the credits for social aid to the aged, and for medical assistance. We want the revision of the social insurance law in the direction of increased relief rates. In addition, we Communists raise the question of the abolition of the dues paid by the workers, social insurance dues to be paid in full by the employers and the State.

While advancing these general demands with the greatest energy, we want at the same time to help our comrades in the Y.C.L.—and this is not being done at present throughout the country—in their stubborn struggle, one which is already giving good results, for the interests of the toiling youth.

To find the necessary source for financing the program of the people's front, we advanced a number of proposals. First of all, we propose that an energetic struggle be carried on against the speculators who get rich on starvation by screwing up prices. We do not as yet demand that they shall be strung up from lamp-posts as in the days of the Sansculottes (during the days of the French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century—*Ed.*), but we want them to be prosecuted and sentenced to heavy terms of imprisonment or to still heavier fines.

We demand the prosecution of those big capitalists who conceal their incomes, and whose names and trickery became particularly clear in

connection with the scandalous business of the Basle bank; the same steps must be taken regarding those who transfer capital abroad, those who, like Tardieu's puppet, Paul Renaud, and the plutocrat Patenstreu, want a new amputation of the franc. In spite of certain statements made by the radical leaders, we are striving to guard the interests of the small depositor. We want to defend those who have gathered some savings for their old age. We want the burdens of the crisis to be put on the parasites and bankers.

Further, we demand a special progressive tax on big incomes, a progressive tax on capital which exceeds 300,000 francs. With the money which the government takes from the rich and the idle we shall buy bread for the unemployed, we shall assist the unfortunate, we shall help the peasants, handicraftsmen and small shopkeepers; we shall provide for the future of those who want to work and for the old age of those who have worked.

But we know that all this can only be achieved by a struggle, only by conducting a consistent class struggle.

Naturally, the program of the people's front, the first point of which is the repeal of the emergency decrees, must contain important democratic demands. The defense of democratic liberties is impossible unless a struggle is carried on to extend them.

The defense of democratic liberties is impossible unless a struggle is also carried on against the activities of the fascist gangs. We demand the dissolution of the fascist organizations. We demand that the fascist elements who swarm in the organs of administration and in the army, be removed from them.

At our national conference, we pointed out the possibility and necessity of supporting not only the demands which we proclaim for the soldiers, but also those of the non-commissioned and junior officers in the army.

Now we know still better than in June that many officers are indignant at the effrontery of the fascists who consider that they may do what they like, and have special privileges. We are prepared to support those officers who take action against the machinations of the fascists.

THE COMMUNISTS AND "LOVE OF THE COUNTRY"

The decisions of the last conference of the C.P. of France met with a profound response in the country. There cannot now be a single comrade who could dispute their effectiveness. When we showed that Communists can be devoted to their country with its revolutionary traditions, and that it is just this that governs their determination to drive as rapidly as possible from the helm of power those who create poverty and starvation and who wish to drag the country into war, when we said all this the workers understood us.

The renegade Doriot has demagogically tried to reproach us for the declaration that "Communists love their country". Doriot was guilty of slander when he pretended that he could not understand the great significance for us which is possessed by the heritage of the best traditions of the great revolution of 1789, by the heroic struggle of June, 1848, and by the proletarian revolutionary traditions of the Commune of 1871.

Yes, we claim the ideological inheritance of the materialists of the eighteenth century. The teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin, brilliantly

continued and developed by Stalin, have their roots in the materialism of the French encyclopedists of the eighteenth century, whose works, according to Engels, helped to prepare for the great bourgeois revolution.

We claim the revolutionary heritage of the Jacobins of 1792 and especially the heroic traditions of the Communards of 1871.

But the French fascists are of the same caliber as the White Guards who, here in Paris as in distant Manchuria, are engaged in instigating intervention against the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union. They are the people who continue other traditions, namely, those of the bloody cut-throat Thiers, the traditions of Coblenz, the traditions of the emigrants of 1792, whose descendants, the gentlemen belonging to the "Young Royalists" and the "Young Patriots"—claim the right to rule over the descendants of the soldiers of the Convention.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST WAR

In respect to the struggle against war, in defense of the Soviet Union and for peace, we think it useful for the people's anti-fascist front to put forward a number of clear and simple slogans.

We consider that the people's front, which cannot and should not put forward the whole program of the Communist Party in its entirety, should support the slogan of general disarmament on the basis of the proposals made by the Soviet Union.

The demand can be made for considerable reductions in the war budgets. In 1934 over 15,000 million francs were expended on war needs. In 1935, the sum proposed is 11,414 million francs, *i.e.*, a quarter of the total budget, to which sum should be added the expenditure of 800 million francs which the War Minister is demanding immediately for the erection of fortifications.

We demand the establishment of control over the manufacture and sale of arms.

Fascism means the sharpening of the war danger in Europe and throughout the whole world. The toilers of France clearly sense this, and have decided to carry on a struggle against war and against fascism, and in their own interests to defend the Soviet Union, the chief international factor of peace.

We are deeply convinced that the whole of this program that we propose corresponds to the interests of the vast majority of the population of our country, the interests of those in France who toil and think.

We appeal to all toilers, workers, officials, peasants, shopkeepers, intellectuals, and ex-servicemen. We have appealed to the Socialist Party to which we sent a draft of the program. We are appealing to the trade unions, the C.G.T. and C.G.T.U.,* the autonomous unions, the peasant and handicraft workers' organizations, and to trade union and cooperative groups. We appeal to all those who want to defend their life and liberty from the encroachments of fascism and the capitalist offensive.

As a result of the conclusion of the pact, we were able and had to go further in the sense of applying our tactics so as to defeat fascism. This is why we allowed the possibility of refraining from advancing our candidates in favor of radical candidates who condemn national

* The reformist and revolutionary unions, respectively, in France.

unity and who repudiate the emergency decrees, in those cases, of course, where the number of votes cast for the Socialists and Communists were insufficient to ensure the defeat of the fascist candidate.

"CLASS AGAINST CLASS" IN 1927 AND IN 1934

The splitter Doriot did not fail to slander the Party in this connection. He even had the effrontery to write that he was right in 1927 and 1929 when he fought against the tactics of "class against class", which he never considered to be correct even after he had capitulated and made hypocritical declarations. No, Doriot and the opportunists were not right in 1927 and they are not right in 1934!

In 1927, when democratic illusions were rife, the failure to use the tactics of "class against class" would have meant dragging in the wake of the petty bourgeoisie, who in turn were fascinated by the big bourgeoisie. It would have meant turning our backs to the future, to the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for socialism and not only to the future but also to the current interests of the working class and the toilers.

In 1934, in the conditions when there is a sharply increased danger of fascism, to use the tactics of "class against class"—in the spirit of the Central Committee—means to draw the petty bourgeoisie into the struggle against capital and against fascism, under the leadership of the proletariat.

The Party can and must carry out these tactics because, having rejected the liquidatory efforts of the renegade Doriot, it has succeeded in becoming an extremely important political factor, a center of attraction, the leader of the broad masses of the proletariat and the toilers of the middle class.

Naturally, it is not a question of establishing a parliamentary program, but of proceeding to mobilize and bring about non-parliamentary mass actions which, in case of necessity, will make it possible to obtain favorable results inside Parliament as well.

It is a question of doing all possible now when we are without the slightest doubt in a much more favorable position than on February 6, 1934, so that the masses offer resistance to fascism and so as to bring about such action as would bring us still greater successes, and to organize a general strike which events may render absolutely necessary.

For this purpose we must go to the factories, to the villages and there propose the election of committees, drawing the masses into them. In order to achieve this purpose, we need not only a correct line but also correct methods. We shall have to make some changes in our methods. We must act with the greatest initiative and realization of our responsibility.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

During the elections in Vitri, Choicis, we said the following to the small middle-class people who at that time were up against the question as to which way to cast their votes: "Make your choice. The Communist Party is advancing to Soviet Power, and to achieve this it is the only party which maintains the revolutionary traditions of the people and really carries on the struggle for freedom.

"You must choose between the Party of the working class which demands work, bread, freedom and peace, and those who speak of free-

dom but who make use of the emergency decrees to oppress you, who want to revise the constitution with a view to still further limiting your rights, and who want to take an example from Hitler, who in Germany first threw many Communists into concentration camps or murdered them, and then began to persecute the Socialists and Democrats, and who first persecuted the Jews and later the Catholics and Protestants."

The petty-bourgeois people began to think: "Under these conditions, can we not draw the conclusion which history puts before us, namely, to counterpose the violence of the working class and the toilers to the violence of the ruling classes?"

We want to defeat fascism and we shall defeat it if we adopt the only true tactics, the tactics of the Bolsheviks, which at the present time correspond to the desire of the masses to rally together for the struggle against fascism.

But correctness is not enough. We need to convince the masses. Is the line of the Comintern correct? It is correct. It can be a thousand times right in our offices and at our meetings, but still the workers will be defeated if we do not succeed in convincing them of the correctness of this line, and particularly if we do not succeed in organizing a mass offensive.

We must not forget that the toilers must learn from their own experience, the lessons of which we must help them to master. Therefore, we must take a similarly vigilant attitude towards organizational questions. Take the work of the Communists in the big mass organizations. Don't you think that it ought to be improved, so as to win the masses of ex-servicemen to our side, without limiting ourselves to the work of our comrades who belong to the Republican ex-servicemen's organization? Here it is not a question of quiet, petty work inside a small organization. We have to reckon with thousands and millions of people.

Take the small traders. There is a general confederation of small traders and handicraft men. It passes beautiful resolutions and holds wonderful congresses, but it has only a few hundred members all told, whereas there are almost a million small shopkeepers in France. Each of these small traders is a member of a general association, then a member of a grocers' or fishmongers' union, etc. But our comrades sit quietly in their tiny organization. It is true that they hurl thunder and lightning at the so-called "reactionary" organizations, but without any noticeable result. It would be better if our comrades went into these organizations and worked there, although, of course, this is more difficult.

The same applies in connection with the peasants. We also think it necessary to call the special attention of the Party to the necessity of an alliance with the oppressed colonial peoples (a tremendous popular movement is developing throughout Northern Africa).

In short, if we are to carry on a successful struggle against fascism we need to bring about the united front of the working class, its alliance with the middle classes and to ensure its leadership in this alliance.

The Socialist Party found our program too "moderate". Paul Faure said: "Our reformism demands more. 'Socialist measures' must be in this program."

Let us examine these objections.

The Social-Democrats pretend to be taken up with the day-to-day

interests of the toilers, and do not and cannot fight for immediate demands, just as they cannot fight for the ultimate aims of the proletariat. The Socialist Party, as we very politely told it in *L'Humanité*, would be extremely pleased if we returned to the sectarian line, carried through in the past by the anti-Party group of Barbe-Selor, and if we were to neglect the immediate demands of the masses.

We are perfectly well aware and repeat that our first successes are linked up with the struggle for immediate demands. Nonetheless, we must recognize the fact that we committed a serious mistake. In the last letter no mention was made of the taxation of capital income tax. This is very important in view of the fact that this is the very core of the question, as to who shall pay the cost of the crisis. The Socialists would have liked to introduce their demand for the "nationalization" of the banks and of sections of industry into this program. And we must reply to this point.

First of all, we must ask them the meaning of nationalization under the capitalist regime. You wish to *rehabilitate* capitalism, we must say, because you speak of "nationalization" whilst at the same time you fight against the dictatorship of the proletariat, against the Soviets. That is why Ziromski is so pleased with the plan of the reformist C.G.T., the social-fascist plan of De Man.* You wish to join the neo-Socialists, to think out a "plan" together *with Dea*.

"NATIONALIZATION"

And we shall say: "Your nationalization, your attempts at so-called 'socialization' are a means of concentrating at the present stage all the elements of big capital, of strengthening the bourgeois regime. The proposals you make and the points to which you aspire will hasten the development of the State towards fascism." To this we shall add: "In the period of crisis all your beautiful phrases about nationalization cannot conceal the real help which you are rendering to capital, by your system of subsidies, at the expense of the toilers." And, moreover, we shall say: "We are also in favor of socialization and nationalization, and all this has already been stated in our letter."

But as far as we are concerned, this is the program of a workers' and peasants' government, it is a program which will be carried into life after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the speech which I delivered from the parliamentary tribune on November 15, I set out a program of demands, and in addition explained our program of Soviet Power, pointing out how power must be seized and the meaning of Soviets in France. Therefore it cannot be said that we neglect these questions. We shall not let the moment pass by when we have to put forward the slogan of nationalization.

We learn from the splendid experience of the Russian Bolsheviks, who gave us a classic example of how and when to advance slogans to correspond with the situation, slogans leading directly to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We have established the united front. The united front is unity for the purpose of carrying through a definite platform of demands, namely, a platform of struggle against fascism, against the war danger and the capitalist offensive. To you we proposed this platform of demands, and not that you accept the program of the Comintern. But you offer us your party program. You write in your articles that a

* See *The Communist International*, Vol. XI, Nos. 12 and 13.

draft must be presented, worked out at the Congress in Toulouse. You can adopt your program at your Congress. We are not concerned with that. What we propose is that you immediately adopt the platform of demands which is the basis of the united front of struggle against fascism, the war danger and the capitalist offensive. We must declare that you are aiming at a break, that you are making use of this proposal as an excuse to break up the Pact.

In this connection, the Socialist Party put the following question to us, Communists: "What will be your attitude towards a government which adopts one or other measures of our program? Will there not be cases where you participate in the government?"

Although there is a difference between the government such as the Doumergue government, and one in which Social-Democrats participate, nevertheless, the latter is and cannot but be a bourgeois and imperialist government. We cannot demand in advance that the Communist Party shall have faith in such a government.

The Communists will behave as they have already said they would: it is quite clear that if any government should adopt a measure which corresponds to the interests of the masses, then we will not fight such a measure, but will support it.

If the government should take action against the fascist bands we will support it, just as we will support action directed against the emergency decrees, action in favor of unemployment benefit. In short, we will support all that is in the interest of the toilers.

As regards the participation of Communists in such a government, can there be two opinions on this question? We calmly answer that the participation of Communists in such a government is out of the question. *There can be no participation whatever in such a government within the bounds of capitalism.* We can recognize only one government, namely, a government which establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat. But the Socialist Party has carried on a struggle and will continue to do so, against the dictatorship of the proletariat and against a Soviet government. But whether you Socialists come to power alone, or whether you come to power together with the radicals, or even only participate in the government, we will support any measures taken by you if they correspond to the interests of the working class, but we shall not maintain any confidence whatsoever in such a government.

THE QUESTION OF A UNITED PARTY

The question of a united party of the proletariat is closely linked up with this. The Socialist workers are striving towards a united party, and are of the opinion that such a party is possible. Besides this, these workers still believe in their Socialist Party, although they feel that all is not well there, although they are discontented. But though they are today engaged in a united front with the Communists against fascism and the war danger, they still are not convinced that the Communists are right, they have not yet broken away from the Socialist Party, the policy of which will inevitably lead the working class to defeat, to the victory of fascism. This process of the passage of the Social-Democratic workers to the Communists is much more complicated. As long as the Social-Democratic workers are not convinced by experience, they will continue to believe in the possibility of merging the Communist and Socialist Parties.

We must stop to think why it is that after having spent a number

of years in explaining our undoubtedly correct principles, we have not made a single step forward. Yet we have pointed out the only correct path, have pointed out that the policy of the Bolsheviks is the only correct policy.

Maybe it is necessary to lose the habit of mechanically imitating Bolshevism and make a better study of what it means and what its methods of work are?

At the time when the entire French press was accusing the Communists in France of becoming "opportunists", a certain author wrote a pamphlet in which he stated the following: "It is only now that they (the Communists) are becoming real followers of Lenin. Hitherto they have only repeated phrases of Lenin, but now they have got right down to the real meaning of Lenin's formulations and have succeeded in transplanting them to the conditions of the struggle in France." This is what a representative of the bourgeoisie says. And when the Socialist, Veull, and others declared that the Communists had given up their views, there were Socialists who said: "You have not apparently read attentively the speeches delivered at their Central Committee meeting, nor the articles written by Vassard and Thorez. These show that the Communists have not given anything up." And Frossard writes that: "They are operating Lenin's policy with exemplary consistency."

THE CHANGE IN THE MOOD OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS

First, the Socialist workers have changed their opinion of us. For 15 years they were told that the Communists are barbarians, slaves and agents of Moscow. But now the Socialist workers are fighting alongside us, are working together with us, and attend our meetings. Second, the Social-Democratic workers are now giving still more decisive support to the Soviet Union. Third, the international experience of the temporary victory of fascism in Germany and Austria has opened their eyes. And so we want to help them and to show them that the principles of the Communists and Social-Democrats differ irreconcilably. But we want to do this through comradely discussions, where everything must be strictly thought out, so as not to repel those first sympathizers whom we have already won over.

Doriot has said that: "The basis for unity is the charter of 1905." We must give a fitting reply to this, comrades, and not be satisfied with a simple "no". The fact that the Socialist Party is making the statement everywhere that, "You know, comrades, we have now got back to the position we were in 30 years ago", has great influence on the masses.

Do you think that the Socialist workers do not believe in the possibility of such unity? They say that "If Jaures and Guesde arrived at an agreement, why cannot Blum and Cachin also agree?" But, when we reply to them, we should not limit ourselves to giving a negative estimate of 1905. We should say that in the historic conditions of the time, 1905 was a step forward. But when a united party was formed in 1905, the reformist elements gained the majority in it and confirmed their rule. This is where we shall have to carry on a struggle against Blum. When people of different views cohabit, this opens the doors to bourgeois ideology and weakens the working class. And we don't want this. And then we add the following: A number of events have taken place since 1905—the war, the collapse of the Second International, the attitude of the Second International to the victory of the socialist revo-

lution in Russia, the socialist revolution in Germany and other countries betrayed by Social-Democracy, the enormous experience of the Soviet Union, while fascism has established its terrorist dictatorship in countries that did not follow the path indicated by Lenin but followed Social-Democracy, Wels, Otto Bauer, Vandervelde, etc.

At meetings we say the following to the Socialist workers who want to form a united party now: "For a long time you have been dissatisfied because we called you social-fascists. This did not apply to you. We never applied this term to you, the Social-Democratic workers. Even Blum himself was forced to declare at your party Congress that: 'I am horrified at the theory of Dea and Marquet.' And were not these people nurtured by your party? Do you not feel that when you suggest that the Communists should unite with a party belonging to the Second International, you propose that we should take a path which will inevitably lead to August 4 (1914), to the victory of fascism and the defeat of the proletariat?"

The Socialist workers are prepared for such arguments. They are prepared to discuss matters. We have spoken, we write very delicately about everything we think necessary, returning constantly to the basic question, namely, that of joint action and committees, and the united front of struggle against fascism and the war danger.

We are carrying on a discussion, and this is not an easy matter. Sometimes mistakes and blunders are made. But we should remember here that our difficulties are now of a different type, and are more complicated than previously. We have succeeded in compelling the Socialist Party to retreat on many points. Now we are faced with *new* difficulties. We must win in the concrete actions which are being conducted on the basis of the united front, and this, of course, is not so easy and not so attractive as to indulge in criticism in "splendid isolation", but leaving the Socialist workers mildly excited about it all. The Party is now in the center of events and is quite well aware of this. Hence every member of the Party, from the Party cell to the C.C., experiences a feeling of great pride and responsibility.

The Party and its forces are developing. For ten years there have been dangerous sectarians in the Party who, while denouncing Social-Democracy, have never tried to make an approach to the Socialist workers. They must now go to the Socialist workers, and carry on a struggle against Social-Democracy by other methods. This is an excellent school in which Communists learn to take account of the sentiments of hundreds of thousands of workers.

The whole Party has become stronger. Not only has the entire policy of the Party improved, but the faith of the whole Party in the C.C. has grown. Just imagine what harm a person like Doriot might have caused the Party. Just imagine the meaning of a split in the Party caused by the pupists, and you will see how the Party has been able to isolate Doriot in the country, shutting him off in the parliamentary group and in the municipalities which he guides, whereas before his treachery, before his counter-revolutionary degeneration, Doriot was one of the most popular members of our Party in France. And now, in St. Denis, we are finally taking the masses away from him. We have restored the district organization which has 500 members. Some of the youth in St. Denis are for us. We hold public meetings there. Andre Marty spoke in the hall of the Legion of Honor before the gas workers, and I spoke in Epigny and Pierrefit to 1,000 workers who welcomed the policy of the C.C. Now in the Socialist section of St. Denis, some of the

Socialist workers are for Doriot's policy and others want to come over to our side. The latter sent delegates to our meetings, and say that "You, the Communist Party and its C.C., are carrying on the real struggle for the united front in France." Thus, the situation in St. Denis has changed in our favor.

The Party has only achieved such results because it has succeeded in winning the workers by the work it has done.

I repeat this once more, though I by no means forget our shortcomings, and fully realize all the blunders, and manifestations of opportunism, of which I have already spoken. We are now correcting the mistakes, we have put an end to the irresponsible methods of work which used to be practiced among us, and which led to the fact that we used to be able to deal with our achievements in five minutes while speaking an hour on our shortcomings.

We now realize our responsibility, and do not gloss over our mistakes and shortcomings, but correct them in the course of the work in the interests of the working class, and make it possible for the working class to check up on the correctness of our policy.

With the help of the Comintern and under its leadership, the Party has begun work which it hopes to complete successfully. We hope that the history of our country, the history of the French proletariat, will confirm the correctness of the thesis of the Thirteenth Plenum, to the effect that *the dictatorship of fascism is not an inevitable stage of capitalism.*

With the help of the Comintern and under its leadership we hope to move rapidly along the path to the Soviet system in France.

Immediate Tasks Facing the Communist Party of Germany

THE TURN TOWARDS A REVOLUTIONARY MASS POLICY

By WILHELM PIECK

I. THE SITUATION IN GERMANY

THE change that has taken place in the objective situation in Germany in the recent period, especially after June 30, confronts the German Communist Party with the need for changing its tactics in the direction of increased revolutionary mass work, and the establishment of a united front and a people's front against fascism.

The general crisis of capitalism has become still more intense, and this fact is felt especially acutely in Germany. The depression of a special kind that began at the end of 1932 led to stagnation in industry in the autumn of 1934. One of the reasons for this stagnation is the increasing scarcity of raw materials and the drop in exports. In various branches of industry, especially in the textile industry, this has already led to a restriction of production and an increase in partial unemployment. In addition to this there are increased difficulties with foreign currencies, the dislocation of the finances of the State and the growing menace of open inflation and of an increase in the cost of living. The agrarian crisis and difficulties consequent on the bad harvest still further sharpen the situation.

The poverty of the toiling masses is increasing day by day. The indignation of the workers, peasants, and middle strata is growing, expressing itself in the growth of the revolutionary class forces, and in the varied forms of activity directed against the Hitler regime. Whereas during the first year of its existence the Hitler Government was able to "provide work" for three million workers and other employees—although this work in the main took the form of forced labor—and thereby to raise certain hopes among the workers to the effect that their standard of living would improve, the position has now changed. The breakdown of the campaign for the so-called "provision of work" is obvious. Thus, for example, the governing board of the forced labor camps declared in December of last year that nobody could count any longer upon being admitted into camps until April 1, 1935. And in Germany the number of unemployed who are almost entirely deprived of assistance is reckoned at six to seven million.

The real wages of the workers have considerably fallen in connection with the high cost of living, increased taxation and deductions from wages under the guise of "contributions" of different kinds. Moreover, the worker is getting goods which are more and more inferior in quality in exchange for the money he earns.

The keen dissatisfaction felt among the peasantry at the measures taken by the government, at the compulsory delivery of agricultural produce at fixed prices, is more and more frequently developing into actions of protest which sometimes even take the form of open revolt, as was the case in Schleswig-Holstein.

No less keen is the poverty and indignation of the urban middle

strata—the artisans and petty traders. Thanks to the measures introduced by Shacht and Goerdler, the trading profits received by these strata have been so much reduced that they are doomed to impoverishment.

The change in the situation is to be seen in the growing desire of the working class for the united front for the purpose of offering joint resistance to the fascist regime. This desire is not everywhere of equal intensity, and receives little expression in open militant activities, but the growing will to offer resistance, and the growing readiness of the working class to fight are expressing themselves more and more clearly.

These phenomena among the working class and its allies—the poorest and middle peasantry and the middle strata in the towns—have already brought in their train a contraction of the mass basis of fascism. Therefore, in order to ensure the preservation of the fascist dictatorship, the bourgeoisie are compelled now to pay attention to the question of reserve positions. We all know of the negotiations that took place on the eve of June 30 between the Social-Democrats, certain groups of Reichswehr generals, and certain conservative elements, German nationalists, which aimed at violating the “totality” of the Hitler government and reconstructing it to include therein the Center Party and the German nationalists, with the support of Social-Democracy. The events of June 30 somewhat paralyzed these efforts at first, but today they are being manifested more and more clearly.

The Communists must carefully watch this process and show the working class that in the event of a reconstruction of the Hitler government on these lines, they must on no account reckon upon any softening down of the fascist dictatorship, and that such a reconstruction would merely mean the creation of another form of fascist dictatorial government, just as hostile to the toiling masses as the Hitler government.

The estimation of the changed situation would be incomplete if we did not call to mind the growing contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie. While in the period at the beginning of the Hitler dictatorship, the old contradictions between agrarian and industrial capital were shifted somewhat to the background, now, on the other hand, they are manifesting themselves more strongly, and the struggle round the distribution of profits is assuming more and more acute forms.

This struggle and these contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie also find expression in friction among the leaders of the fascist dictatorship. One section of the National Socialists, for example, the group headed by Shacht, is endeavoring to fulfill the orders given by finance capital by conducting an open offensive against the standard of living of the toiling masses, and to secure the reduction of the wages of the workers by a merciless, open campaign against them; while the other section, the so-called “old guard” are anxious to camouflage this plan with a policy of social demagoguery and certain concessions to the petty bourgeoisie.

We should not overestimate the existing disagreements among the leaders of the fascist dictatorship and of the National Socialist Party, as is frequently done in our press where we meet with formulations like “the ever-sharpening crisis of the fascist dictatorship” or the “deep crisis” of the fascist dictatorship. The ability of the fascist dictatorship to maneuver is very much restricted by the growth of the revolutionary class forces and of economic difficulties, but it still continues to exist, and we must reckon with it.

Under the influence of the economic difficulties in the country and with a view to raising their capacity to compete on the world market, the financial and industrial capitalists are resorting to an increased offensive against the wages of the workers and, consequently, upon the standard of living of the other strata of toilers. It should be borne in mind that this increased offensive of capital which aims at cutting down wages will be one of the next measures to be adopted by the bourgeoisie.

The June 30 events severely shook the illusions among the toiling population concerning the stability of the Hitler dictatorship. The July (1934) session of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I., at which the German question was discussed, was perfectly justified in speaking of the beginning of the crisis of the fascist dictatorship. It is clear that after June 30 a considerable increase was to be observed *especially in the ranks of the working class*, in the desire to offer resistance to the fascists. But the Communist Party did not succeed in making sufficient use of this favorable position for the purpose of establishing a united front of struggle against fascism. The reason for this was partly the fact that the Communist Party did not adapt our tactics in sufficient time to meet the changing objective situation, was not sufficiently opportune in passing to really revolutionary mass work. As a result, Social-Democracy found itself in a position where it could once more secure influence upon the masses of its members which it had almost lost, and to renew its organizational contacts in the country.

Germany's prospects are obvious. Germany, as hitherto, remains the weakest link in the imperialist chain. Under the existing trend of development, class contradictions are once more becoming sharpened to an extraordinary degree, and this is leading to the unfolding of more extensive mass battles. This will, of course, depend to a considerable extent upon the work of the Communist Party, upon how quickly and on what scale the Party succeeds in organizing the united front of the working class and the people's front in town and village.

Consequently, we must not over-estimate our influence over the Social-Democratic workers—and this sort of over-estimation can be met with over and over again in the Communist press. The Communists are still confronted with a very serious struggle to win the masses, to free them from Social-Democratic influence and to draw them into the revolutionary struggle.

This is of especially great importance in connection with the fact that the bourgeoisie, in consequence of the difficulties inside the country, are beginning to conduct a foreign policy that is ever more and more adventurist and provocative in character, a policy of speeding up preparations for imperialist war, and first and foremost counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R.

The monstrous rapidity with which armaments are being built in the country coupled with the chauvinist calumny, and the constant boasting of the Rosenberg plan which is directed against the Soviet Union, reveal with all possible clarity the criminal war plans of the Hitler government.

II. THE RESULTS OF THE SAAR PLEBISCITE

The Saar plebiscite, like a flash of lightning, showed up the danger threatening the toiling masses in the face of fascist, chauvinistic war dances. The mighty demonstrations of the united front in the Saar

against Hitler fascism created the impression that a large section, and in some places the majority, of the population would vote against joining Hitler Germany by way of protest against Hitler fascism.

The Communists must thoroughly master the profound meaning of this voting. We appealed to the toiling population of the Saar with the slogan, "For the *status quo*", inviting them to vote against joining Hitler Germany at the present moment, so as to defeat Hitler in the Saar. But by voting for the *status quo*, the population had to decide to remain under the foreign yoke they hated so much, one which for 15 years had oppressed and robbed them. And so the decision to vote for the *status quo* made great demands upon the class-consciousness of the workers, and required that the Communists conduct a determined struggle against nationalism and chauvinism, required a deep, ideological, campaign of enlightenment.

The result of the Saar plebiscite shows that we did not fulfill this task, that we did not succeed in overcoming nationalistic sentiments even in our own ranks. At the last elections to the Saar parliament in 1932, 86,000 votes were cast for the German Communist Party alone, while at the plebiscite just past, only 46,500 votes were cast for the *status quo*. Of course, it should be borne in mind that during the elections to the Saar parliament, which took place before Hitler seized power, the German Communist Party advocated the unification of the Saar with Germany.

How are we to explain the results of the plebiscite? Was the slogan, "for the *status quo*" a correct one? We are all unanimous in considering that the slogan was put forward correctly: it corresponded to the interests of the toiling masses of the Saar, and also corresponded to the interests of the proletarian revolution in Germany. It was a slogan against the Hitler regime, in defense of the population against that regime; it was a slogan of proletarian internationalism, directed against the chauvinism which was poisoning the masses.

Our slogan corresponded to the Leninist slogan of defeatism (the defeat of one's own bourgeois government) a slogan which the Bolsheviks put forward during the World War. Then, also, when Social-Democracy and the Second International betrayed proletarian internationalism, when there was a monstrous display of chauvinist calumny, this slogan at first met with little response among the toiling masses. But through stubborn propaganda of the slogan, the Bolsheviks succeeded in winning over increasingly broad masses of the working class and petty bourgeoisie to their side. The victory of the October Revolution fully confirmed the correctness of this slogan as far as the toiling masses were concerned.

Our slogan during the Saar plebiscite—"For the *status quo*"—corresponded to the Bolshevik slogan of the defeat of one's own government. To decide in favor of this slogan could only be the result of a high level of class-consciousness.

The 46,500 who voted for the *status quo* were people who not only withstood the chauvinist calumny, but who also understood that in such a difficult situation it was essential to vote against their own government.

It is absolutely clear that the broad masses who voted for unification with Hitler Germany, were on no account voting, thereby, in favor of Hitler's fascist dictatorship. The extensive demonstrations which took place against Hitler fascism in the Saar showed this clearly. And now, after the union with Hitler Germany, these masses will continue to

fight in a united front against Hitler fascism and will assist to overthrow it. But the task of the German Communist Party is to bring these masses into the united front and to organize a revolutionary mass struggle against Hitler fascism in Germany itself and in the Saar.

It is impossible to give a correct appraisal of the results of the plebiscite if we do not take into consideration the difficulties which lay in the way of popularizing our slogan. I shall not enumerate here all the difficulties which faced us in the Saar, but will indicate only a few important points.

The Hitler fascists set up a monstrous apparatus in the Saar. They expended colossal sums of money on agitation, and resorted to unprecedented terror against the population through the medium of the "German Front" and other fascist bands. Added to this there was also chauvinistic calumny. But we Communists should have taken this into consideration. However, we neither sufficiently bore in mind the chauvinism with which the fascists poisoned the minds of the masses nor did we sufficiently concentrate our attention or fight against it. We imagined that in fighting against fascist terror, against fascism, we were thereby conducting a struggle against chauvinism, although even this struggle was not conducted with sufficient determination.

We succeeded—partly in spite of the resistance of Social-Democracy—in so influencing the Catholics, who represent 72 per cent of the Saar population, that a section of the clergy came over to the united front and declared themselves ready to vote for the *status quo* (because of this pressure, the Catholic "National Alliance" was organized). Nonetheless the princes of the Church, the Speier and Trier bishops, succeeded by means of the most powerful pressure brought to bear upon the Catholic population, in instigating them to vote against their own interests for union with Hitler Germany. The agreement concluded in Rome between Hitler and the Pope without doubt contributed towards this. Here also we underestimated the great influence of religion upon the masses. We were glad that the Catholic population took part in the demonstrations organized by the Communists, but we paid too little attention to developing struggles on behalf of the economic demands of the Catholic masses.

The behavior of Social-Democracy was of considerable importance in connection with the results of the plebiscite. True, the Social-Democratic organization in the Saar had a united front with us and was in favor of the *status quo*, but Social-Democracy threw big obstacles in the way of spreading the united front to the Catholic workers and of the creation of organized, mass self-defense units against the Hitler terror. We had to compel the Social-Democrats to agree to these points.

The "Prague" leaders of German Social-Democracy, however, under the pressure of their members, took up a position in favor of the *status quo* in words—although they did not agree with this slogan—openly sabotaged the united front of the struggle for the *status quo* and took no measures actively to support this struggle. The Social-Democratic trade union leaders in the Saar also fought against action in favor of the *status quo*, their motive being that the plebiscite was allegedly a political affair which did not concern the trade unions, the trade unions being neutral. It was only in the middle of December when the mining organizations amalgamated, that the trade union leaders adopted the slogan of, "For the *status quo*". But this was one month before the plebiscite took place.

The reason why the Social-Democratic Party leaders sabotaged the struggle in the Saar was actually due to the fact that these leaders are against the united front between the Communists and Social-Democrats, since it contradicts the general line of German Social-Democracy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. The Social-Democrats have declared on numerous occasions that the united front would drive the toiling masses, the peasants and middle strata, away from Social-Democracy, and make it difficult for the latter to restore its influence over them. And now we meet with a similar argument in an article which has appeared in the Zurich *Volksrecht*. In this article an attempt is made to explain the result of the plebiscite by the so-called "spectre of Bolshevism", by the suggestion that the electors did not want Red terror in the place of the Brown terror.

And so, under the pretext of the "spectre of Bolshevism", Social-Democracy opposed *revolutionary* methods of struggle against fascism. We have here an open manifestation of the hostile attitude of the Social-Democratic leaders to the united front, since it prevents Social-Democracy from once again arranging class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, from once again being included in the State apparatus as the main social prop of the bourgeoisie.

The Saar plebiscite provides a very serious lesson for the Communist Party and the German working class. We must take note of the weaknesses and defects of which we were guilty in our conduct of the united front campaign for the *status quo* in the Saar.

Not only did we begin this campaign too late. We did not link it up sufficiently with the struggle for immediate demands and with everyday action against French and German capital in the Saar. We paid too much attention to the conduct of meetings and demonstrations as a pure campaign all of which passed off with great enthusiasm and with great success on the surface. The big demonstrations organized in the Saar against Hitler fascism, the thousands of smaller meetings in the localities and factories, and the more energetic work carried on in the trade unions—all go to prove that we won certain positions in the struggle against the fascist dictatorship.

However, one big defect in our work was that we did not succeed at the same time in explaining to the masses why, in the existing conditions, they must at the given moment vote against linking up with Germany. We made a poor estimate of the mood of the masses. It was no accident that our Saar newspaper on January 14, *i.e.*, a day after the plebiscite, when the results, it is true, were still not yet known, wrote about the victory of the *status quo*, of the defeat of Hitler in the Saar and of how Hitler would never enter the Saar. This shows that we were still unable to listen to the voice of the masses, and therefore did not understand that despite their negative attitude towards Hitler fascism, the masses were imbued with nationalist feelings and did not want to remain any longer under the domination of those in occupation, but preferred to join Germany now, even though it is Hitler Germany.

But our main mistake—and this must be emphasized again, is that we did not conduct an ideological and political struggle against the chauvinistic calumny indulged in by the fascists. We did not succeed in explaining to the masses that by voting for the *status quo*, they were voting not against Germany, but against Hitler, and that by voting for the *status quo* they were actually helping to bring about the rapid downfall of Hitler. We did not succeed in explaining to them that by

voting for unification with Hitler Germany, they were organizing a victory for Hitler, which he would use only to the detriment of the toiling masses.

This is a lesson which must be taken into account not only at the present moment but for the whole of our struggle against capitalism, and against its military policy. The increasing danger of a new imperialist world war or counter-revolutionary war against the U.S.S.R. puts forward in all its magnitude and as the most urgent task facing the Party, the problem of winning the toiling masses to the side of proletarian internationalism and of mustering them under our slogan of the defeat of one's own government. And therefore it is important to popularize these lessons of the Saar plebiscite among the toiling masses throughout the whole country, and at the same time to conduct a struggle which will prepare the overthrow of the Hitler regime.

III. SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

As a result of the June 30 events, the Social-Democratic Party leaders succeeded once again in reinforcing themselves in the country, and in establishing contacts with Social-Democratic groups and organizations. Social-Democracy is on the eve of the restoration of a centralized network of organizations. In spite of our efforts to reestablish the free trade unions in Germany, a number of reformist trade union groups have already even been created. This has led to a situation where a number of the Social-Democratic groups, with whom we were already negotiating partly on the question of amalgamation, partly on the question of the united front, are taking up a waiting attitude towards us, declaring that first of all "those at the top must come to an agreement among themselves". Of course, this was a pretext supplied to them by the Prague leadership of the Social-Democratic Party with a view to preventing agreement being achieved directly between the rank-and-file organizations of the Communists and the Social-Democrats.

However, we should reckon with the fact that we not only gave Social-Democracy this opportunity by our insufficiently determined policy on the united front, but that a very serious danger arises out of this for the establishment of the united front in general. The Social-Democratic Party leaders are anxious once again to bring about a situation where Social-Democracy becomes the chief social prop of the bourgeoisie. The policy of the Social-Democratic Party leaders is most unambiguously directed towards class collaboration, towards a repetition of the policy of the lesser evil, and Social-Democracy will support any fascist government that will give it a minimum amount of freedom of action. This is a big danger for the united front, for the danger arises that Social-Democracy will once more try to win big sections of Social-Democratic workers to support the policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie.

The line taken by the Social-Democratic Party leaders is, of course, being resisted by the Social-Democratic workers and by some of the Social-Democratic functionaries. This is reflected mainly in all the different kinds of platforms which are being put forward by so-called opposition groups—the Miles group and the Aufgeuser group—which have now, apparently, arrived at an agreement, the basis of which is the platform of the so-called "Union of Revolutionary Socialists" ("Arbeitskreis der revolutionären Sozialisten"). The Communist Party must make a serious effort to win all the groups throughout the country connected with them to support for the united front.

It goes without saying that the Communists should carry on a theoretical struggle against the viewpoints represented by this "Union of Revolutionary Socialists", since these views are fraught with the danger of once again causing dissension among the working class. Of course, the question must not be simplified in this way: that it is only a question of a division of labor between the Social-Democratic Party leaders and the oppositional groups, with a view to preventing the workers from joining the Communist Party and the united front. We must make a serious attempt to understand and to deepen the differences among the Social-Democratic leaders. We must try to place the Social-Democratic officials who are opposed to this policy before the dilemma of either support for the united front and operating the united front together with us, or of unmasking themselves in the eyes of the masses as opponents of the united front.

VI. OUR REVOLUTIONARY MASS WORK

The Communist Party of Germany must in its mass work clearly reveal its general line—the general plan of Communist policy. We must pursue this or that policy not as each individual case arises; we must not drag at the tail of events, but must call attention to them in advance. We must show clearly to the broadest masses that there is only one way out of poverty under fascism, that the way out is possible only through revolutionary mass struggle, through the organization of the united front, of the front of the toiling masses of the people and of the organization of the proletarian revolution, under the leadership of the Communist Party. The masses should see this clearly in the general plan of our work.

The Communist Party has not yet hitherto succeeded in achieving this. In its mass work, the Communist Party of Germany does not yet put forward slogans which attract the masses, slogans which they can understand, for which they are prepared to fight in a united front. The slogans of the Communist Party of Germany are still too abstract and artificial, they do not arise out of the needs and the requirements of the masses. The Communist Party will only win over the masses when it succeeds in overcoming this shortcoming.

We must make immediate daily demands as our starting point: whether it is the demand for "work with adequate wages", wage increases, the fight against fascist labor legislation, against forced labor, against the dismissal of the youth from enterprises, against speeding up the preparations for imperialist war and against militarization, against fascist terror, and on behalf of the release of proletarian prisoners. We must make these daily demands the starting point for the organization of the united front so that this united front, the people's anti-fascist front, shall be the medium through which we can lead the toiling masses to the decisive battles for the overthrow of the fascist regime and of the domination of the bourgeoisie.

If we examine the work of the Communist Party of Germany from this point of view, we must, as a matter of self-criticism, declare that our mass work is still not of such a character. We need an independent, concrete and revolutionary policy. We must pass from agitation and propaganda, which to a certain extent we already know how to conduct in illegal conditions, to the organization and conduct of struggles.

One of the most important means of rallying and drawing the

masses into the united front, into the fight against fascism, is our slogan regarding the re-establishment of the free trade unions. The Communists have not fallen victims to the illusions that it is possible under the fascist dictatorship to set up big illegal mass organizations but this slogan has become part of the flesh and blood of millions of workers, who were once organized in the free trade unions. These workers recognize that, by smashing the trade union movement, fascism deprived them of part of their lives. And if we succeed in bringing this slogan to the masses, we shall get an opportunity of rallying the masses to fight, not only to put this slogan into practice, but also to overthrow the fascist dictatorship.

There is one important task, namely, to rally the masses and organize the revolutionary mass struggle and so to bring about a break in the framework of fascist legality, laws and measures directed against the toiling masses, to smash the discipline forced on them by the fascists, and thus to shake the foundations of the positions which fascism has created for itself among the masses through pressure, terror, etc.

We must take into consideration the serious difficulties which make it difficult to conduct open fighting actions. There is not the slightest doubt that every insignificant action today in the difficult conditions of the fascist regime, when the masses are held down by the most ferocious terror, assumes far greater importance than hitherto. (Such action may consist of skilfully raising some question or other at fascist meetings and putting forward definite demands: the despatch of a delegation to the factory management or to the fascist authorities; refusal to carry out the conditions fixed by the employers; rejections of attempts to reduce wages, without strikes but by passive resistance.) It is essential to combine illegal methods of work with the use of semi-legal and legal possibilities even in the conditions of the fascist dictatorship.

A number of examples can be used to show that if broad, militant, closely connected activities do not as yet take place, there is at any rate a wave of scattered, partial acts of mass resistance to fascism. It is just for this reason that the fascist dictatorship has not hitherto dared to fulfil the task set it by the finance capitalists when it took over the reins of power, namely, of conducting an open offensive against the working class with a view to lowering wages. Fascism senses the strong resistance offered by the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie to the legislation and measures it has put through, and is afraid at the same time of calling forth an open struggle on the part of the working class.

Real wages have fallen in consequence of the high cost of living, taxation and deductions, but nominal wages have remained at the same level or at any rate they have not dropped to any considerable extent. This makes it difficult for the Communists to launch open militant action by the factory workers. Where attempts have been made to cut down wages, resistance was displayed quite openly even in the "labor front" and in the N.S.B.O. (the Nazi factory organization).

Further, it is an extremely important task to organize oppositions in the fascist mass organizations: in the "labor front", into which the former members of the free trade unions have been driven by force, in the sports societies, in the "Hitler Youth" organizations—in a word, everywhere where the toilers and proletarians have been organized under compulsion.

The Communist Party of Germany is only beginning work in this sphere. Although the Party leadership has given detailed instructions,

the Communist Party has still not succeeded in setting serious work going in these organizations. And so one of the most important tasks facing the Party is to convince our Party forces, the masses of our Party members, that side by side with the struggle to restore the free trade unions, it is essential to carry on work in the fascist mass organizations.

A similar weakness can be observed in the *work of the Communist Party in the factories*. Thanks to the extension of production with the change to the depression of a special kind, the larger part of the Party membership again secured work in the factories, in contradistinction to former times when it was the Communists who were the first to be dismissed from the factories. In spite of this, however, the Communist Party has not succeeded in organizing serious work in the factories in the difficult conditions of underground activity. Here there is to be seen not only capitulation in the face of difficulties, but (especially insofar as it is a question of work to restore the free trade unions and work in the fascist mass organizations) one can feel the sectarian line, and obstacles which arise out of the failure to understand the revolutionary importance of work in these organizations.

Let us examine the work among the proletarian *youth* and the *toiling women*. The weaknesses which are to be found in the Communist Party of Germany in connection with work among the adults are still more acutely felt in its work among the *toiling youth*, although it is just the youth who, to a greater extent than the adults, are subject to the influence of chauvinism. Nevertheless, we have not succeeded in concentrating the attention of our Party on the need for this work, we have not succeeded in rendering the Y.C.L. serious assistance in carrying on extensive mass work among the toiling youth. In this direction the Communist Party has issued definite instructions, but a big shortcoming in its work is that the Communist Party of Germany has not succeeded in a sufficient degree in securing that these instructions reach the rank-and-file Party members and the masses, and has not succeeded in getting these instructions carried out.

To draw the toiling women into the united front, into active struggle against the employers and against fascism, is also a task that the German Communists have neglected up to now, and this has brought not a little harm to the establishment of the united front. We can point to extremely good examples, where factory women have energetically resisted attempts of the employers to worsen their conditions of labor. We can also point to facts which prove that the working women are evincing considerable self-sacrifice and great dexterity in the illegal struggle, but in spite of this, the Communists have not succeeded in rallying the toiling women for the struggle.

A weak spot in the work of the Communist Party of Germany is also *its policy toward the allies of the proletariat*. There have not been sufficient attempts made to establish Communist influence in the village among the poor and middle peasants, as well as among the urban petty bourgeoisie, although in this respect favorable opportunities exist. The indignation felt in the rural districts offers wide possibilities for the work of the Communists. If we issue correct slogans, and carry on the proper work, we can organize an opposition and a fighting front among these strata as well, so as to undermine the mass base of fascism here most of all. And so the establishment of the united front must be closely linked up with the establishment of the people's anti-fascist front. The

united front of the working class and the people's front, the united front plus our allies, the toiling peasants and the middle strata, do not represent two parallel tasks, but one task, while the proletariat must be ensured the leadership of the people's front.

VII. CONCERNING THE INTERNAL PARTY SITUATION

The leaders of the Communist Party of Germany clearly see the weaknesses and shortcomings in our work, as well as the mistakes we have made. It should be noted that there was not ideological clarity in the Party leadership either, on the question of the united front tactics as the next step, as one of the links in the chain of our struggle to win the majority of the working class. This even led to our united front tactics being understood by the masses of our members as a heeling over to the Right, *i.e.*, as a deviation.

A larger number of the difficulties encountered in operating these tactics must be put down to the failure to understand the essence of the united front. This misconception and these mistakes were also to be found in the documents which the Communist Party of Germany sent out from the Center, and in articles of leading comrades, in formulations which incorrectly dealt with the question of the united front and, in this connection, with the question of the Social-Democratic leadership and the opposition groupings within Social-Democracy. The Party leaders of the C.P.G. quite clearly appreciate the necessity for fully rectifying these mistakes. It will only enhance the authority of the Party leaders if they display the greatest frankness in being self-critical before the Party and if they energetically counteract sectarian theories and the manifestation of Right opportunism.

The Party must understand that in establishing the united front and the people's front, the sectarian viewpoint that this allegedly constitutes a deviation from the revolutionary line, is the main obstacle in the way of launching the struggle of the masses, the way of winning the majority of the working class. But at the same time we must always reckon with, and carry on, a merciless struggle against Right opportunist deviations, against avoidance of difficulties and against capitulation to Social-Democracy. This internal Party task is one of the most important tasks facing us, if we do not wish to make it possible for Social-Democracy once more to reinforce its influence among the Social-Democratic workers.

We must increase Bolshevik vigilance to the utmost in relation to the Rights and conciliators, who are trying to use the weaknesses and mistakes in our Party work for the purpose of again coming to the forefront. They are even trying to present the picture as though their previous policy, a false policy, which deviated from the Party line, is now being pursued by the Party. They are thus trying to mislead the masses of Party members. Certain of the conciliators are trying to criticize the Party "from the Left", and are offering their services to the Party in the capacity of "radical" elements.

All this amounts to attempts being made to politically gloss over the line of the Party and to discredit this line, in order to once again take possession of the Party leadership.

There are facts which go to prove that certain conciliators maintained contacts with elements of the counter-revolutionary Zinoviev-Trotskyist group, with those elements who were responsible for the monstrous crime—the murder of Comrade Kirov. Contact was estab-

lished by them with this thoroughly foul, anti-Soviet group which went over to the fascist camp, which made double-dealing the basis of its relations with the Party and which took the path of White-Guardist terrorism, so as to make it difficult for the leaders of the Communist Party of Germany to conduct their revolutionary course for the establishment of the united front, and the people's front against fascism.

It is an elementary task for the Communist Party of Germany as well to make use of the lessons provided by the C.P.S.U. in connection with these events, to display the greatest vigilance and irreconcilability towards all deviations, and to resist all attempts to undermine the Party and to hinder it from putting the line laid down into actual practice.

The task which faces the Communist Party of Germany is to establish the united front and the people's front, to organize the proletarian revolution, and all the members of the Party must fulfil this task with the greatest of enthusiasm. For it is precisely the example set us by the C.P.S.U., and confirmed by the colossal victories of socialist construction, which is the best assistance to the Communist Party of Germany in carrying out its revolutionary task, of leading the German workers to the struggle for power, on the lines of the great Socialist October Revolution.

Intensify the Struggle for the United Front of the Proletariat

By V. MULLER

A CHANGE must be brought about in the policy of the Communist Party of Germany. In what direction? In the direction of intensifying the struggle for the organization and development of the united front, of a wide anti-fascist front of the people. If this is so, the leaders of the C.P.G. must first and foremost make a serious attempt to prove the need for this change in its policy to the Party itself.

The Party leaders must explain to the members of the Communist Party and to the entire working class of Germany that the proletarian revolution in Germany is again threatened with a great danger. Some of the forces of the bourgeoisie may again obtain influence over the growing opposition to the Hitlerite regime and may utilize it as part of a new mass basis if changes should be made in the form taken on by the fascist dictatorship, and in the government. These changes do not always take the shape of explosions, and events do not always assume the character of those of June 30.

This danger is all the more serious because the split of the German working class brought about by Social-Democracy has not yet been overcome, and the C.P.G. has not yet won the majority of the working class, while the Social-Democratic leaders are striving to form a coalition with bourgeois groups.

The task facing the Party is to cut right across this policy of the bourgeois groups and Social-Democracy, and at any rate, if a change does take place in the form of the dictatorship of capital, to ensure that this change take place on such a narrow basis that the regime will not be able to offer further resistance to the onslaught of the proletarian revolution.

It must be explained to the Party that the destruction of the mass basis of fascism will develop at a more rapid and even at a headlong speed, if the Party succeeds in carrying on untiring work among the masses, in drawing all the workers and toilers who are discontented with fascism into a fighting united front, and in rallying them to the people's front, and thus by every means hastening the speed at which the regime becomes discredited, disintegrated and undermined.

We must convince all Party comrades that this united front policy and the development of a wide people's front make it possible for the Party to set going the necessary mass actions by means of which the Party will intensify the disagreement in the camp of the bourgeoisie, sharpen the crisis among those at the top and severely shake the regime.

The united front policy will bring the masses to undertake big struggles to overthrow the Hitlerite dictatorship. The anti-fascist people's front will ensure that the Party has allies in these class battles.

THE CRISIS OF THE FASCIST DICTATORSHIP DOES NOT DEVELOP OF ITSELF

The crisis of the fascist dictatorship has already begun. But it does not develop of itself. The tremendous economic difficulties that have arisen have not yet led to the automatic downfall of the regime.

The fascist dictatorship can only be overthrown by an armed uprising of the workers and toilers. As long as the working masses, and with them the broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasants, fail to carry on a struggle, fascism will always find it possible to gloss over and soften down the disagreements in its own ranks, to put off the explosion and even to prevent it.

The contradictions in the fascist camp will become more intense, and it is the task of the C.P.G. to develop and organize the mass struggles of broad strata of the toilers and of the working class.

The events of June 30 were the first serious convulsion to shake the regime. But on June 30 the Communist Party was not yet in a position to make sufficient use of the open explosion of the contradictions in the fascist camp, in the interests of the proletariat. The Communist Party proved unable to set the masses of the workers in the industrial districts into motion, and to unleash such mass activity as would have helped to further weaken the regime. As a result of this, a regrouping of forces took place—and, what is more, it took place without serious resistance from the oppositional proletarian elements in the storm detachments—and the center of gravity was moved in the direction of the Reichswehr. The reason why the C.P.G. was unable to organize mass action by the workers was that it did not clearly understand the situation that had arisen. It was primarily for this reason that it did not develop a wide movement in favor of the united front.

It is quite clear that the objective difficulties facing the fascist dictatorship are growing. These objective difficulties, however, should not be exaggerated, and above all they must not be brought to the forefront, because this plays into the hands of the Social-Democrats who advance the theory that fascism will automatically collapse, and assists the development in our own ranks of a speculation on spontaneity. The development of the abilities of the masses is still the decisive point.

Germany is faced with a shortage of foreign currency and raw materials, while there has been a decline in her balance of trade. But this will by no means bring about a crash. As we know, the bourgeoisie have always a means of struggling against this, namely, by more intensively plundering the masses. It is precisely in this way that the monopoly capitalist magnates in Germany intend to act with all consistency.

ORGANIZE THE UNITED FRONT

The objective difficulties facing fascism are growing, but the subjective factor of the revolution is lagging behind. We must give ourselves this serious warning, and must make every effort to catch up on the time lost, and reduce the gap between the growth of the objective difficulties which face German fascism, and the strengthening of the subjective factor of the revolution. And this can only be achieved by organizing a very wide united front with the Social-Democratic workers and organizations. For the Hitler government is even now making use of the split and the division of the ranks of its opponents, and primarily of the scattered character of the anti-fascist forces of the proletariat. The reason why the Hitler government has succeeded, if not in solving some problems at any rate in overcoming individual difficulties, is because as long as the proletariat was split it could not proceed to undertake extensive actions, and the discontented toiling masses did not fight in a solid, unbroken front. Hence, it is clear that

those who want to defeat fascism must strive to bring about the united front, the anti-fascist people's front.

Therefore, the leaders of the C.P.G. call on all the Party organizations in the country to address themselves once more to the Social-Democratic groups, organizations and committees with a view to achieving agreement regarding joint struggle, and to concluding agreements on the united front. In those places where the majority of the members of the Social-Democratic Party do not yet agree, for one reason or another, with the policy of the united front, an attempt must be made to bring about collaboration with the minority, to prove by convincing examples the correctness of the united front tactics, and thus to win the majority of the Social-Democratic workers for support of the united front.

In the struggle against the working class and the Communists, fascism was forced to extend considerably its expensive State apparatus. The fierce terror is now being carried out to an ever greater degree through the State apparatus. The proletariat and the toilers are beginning to offer up strong resistance, a feature which finds expression in numerous small actions in the factories and inside the fascist organizations built on a compulsory basis.

On the other hand, an increase is taking place in the activity of Social-Democratic Party officials, directed towards restoring Social-Democracy. Now already, Social-Democracy is, if not a party, then at any rate a weak cemented union with a center at Prague, to which the "Lefts" also belong. We may say that a definite and centralized organizational network of Social-Democrats has now been established.

At the same time the old conservative forces have also begun to move. They have taken up an oppositional position, have made contacts with the Social-Democratic leaders, and together with them have formed a committee of seven (the so-called coalition committee) to carry on a struggle for a new coalition.

The Communist Party, however, did not promptly take account of the fact that the situation had changed—especially does this refer to the activity of the Social-Democrats—and therefore did not develop a bold and extensive united front policy.

We fought to win over the active Social-Democratic workers to our Party, and thought that in this way we could prevent the formation of a second illegal Party, but did not understand that it is only a broad united front policy that can prevent the renewal of the split in the working class. It should not be forgotten that in 1918 the bourgeoisie succeeded in crushing the proletarian revolution in Germany, simply because they had a wide mass basis on which they could rest, namely, Social-Democracy, which was the strongest buttress of the Weimar regime.

In various fascist countries, the Social-Democratic Parties, as legal organizations, are conducting a struggle against the spread of Bolshevism. This is why the consolidation of Social-Democracy is such a tremendous danger for the proletarian revolution. The proletarian revolution will demand greater sacrifices if the German bourgeoisie succeed once again in basing themselves in their struggle on Social-Democracy. This must be prevented. Therefore the united front with the Social-Democratic workers is a most urgent necessity.

We see that the Social-Democratic Party leaders are aiming at

a new coalition. This is why they are already concluding an alliance with the bourgeois opposition groups. But the majority of the Social-Democratic workers are against an alliance with those who obviously bred fascism. They want a united front with us Communists. We must arrange our tactics to suit this determination of the majority of the Social-Democratic workers, and must develop the united front on a wide scale.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE "LEFT" LEADERS

But although the mood of the majority of the Social-Democratic workers, and many of the Social-Democratic Party officials is antagonistic to the German Social-Democratic leaders now in Prague, there is not a single more or less important Social-Democratic group which does not feel the influence of the "Prague" C.C. in some way, this influence being partly brought to bear through "Left" leaders. The discipline of the "Left" leaders at the present time still takes the ascendancy over their desire to carry on a struggle against the majority of the "Prague" leaders who are still hostile to the united front policy. The C.C. of the C.P.G. addressed itself to the "Left" leaders, in an effort to come to terms with them as to a joint struggle against fascism. The "Left" leaders rejected our proposal. They suggested that we should direct ourselves to the "Prague" C.C. These "Left" leaders who are grouped around Aufhäuser and Boechel have in practise hitherto attempted to hinder the development of the united front in Germany, although in their articles abroad they sometimes advocate the united front to a certain degree. The "Left" leaders in the "Prague" C.C. of the S.P.G.—and they must be told this—must take note that they will not be able for very long to carry on a diplomatic game and a double-dealing policy towards the workers.

It must, however, be recognized that we somewhat help the "Left" leaders in their game by the mistakes we make. But we correct our mistakes. Instead of the "Left" leaders drawing conclusions from our proposals, they refer us to the "Prague" leaders of the S.P.G., and in view of this, their declarations as to their readiness for the united front naturally lose all value, although Aufhäuser writes that, "there was action at first". Nevertheless, when we approached him with a united front proposal, he did not draw the necessary conclusions. We, however, are bending every effort to take new steps in this direction.

In this connection we state that we are prepared to make united front proposals in a suitable form and on a suitable occasion to the "Prague" leadership as well, since we have become convinced in the course of the struggle for the united front that the Social-Democratic workers in various parts of the country will support us in this respect, and this is the basic condition for the success of this step. We declare that we shall do everything possible in the future with the aid of the Social-Democratic workers to influence the "Left" leaders, and to stimulate them to bring about the establishment of the united front. We call on them to struggle against those in the "Prague" leadership of the S.P.G. who are opposed to the united front to overcome their own hesitancy, and to conclude a united front with us in spite of their links with the "Prague" C.C.

It is in this spirit that we wish to educate our own Party, so that our Party organizations enter into close contact with all those Left Social-Democratic workers and party officials who are carrying on a struggle against the opponents of the united front in their leading bodies.

Wherever we succeed in doing so, we shall rapidly win the majority, because the majority of the rank-and-file Social-Democratic workers are for the united front with us. By means of the united front, we want to link up more closely with our Social-Democratic class comrades, to paralyze the Right Social-Democratic leaders and restrict their freedom of action in the struggle which they are carrying on for collaboration with the bourgeoisie. We are sure that as a result of carrying on the united front, the Social-Democratic workers will regard it a betrayal of their interests if the Social-Democratic leaders form a coalition with the bourgeoisie, and hundreds of thousands of them will come over to our side.

We shall conclude united front pacts. But at the same time we shall not restrict our own initiative by these united front pacts, but we shall try on our part to maintain a businesslike and comradely character in the tone, language and criticism we utilize. In no case shall we give up our struggle of principles, but in the given situation we shall carry it on a more positive form than in the past, explaining the great objective which faces the working class. By means of the united front policy we want to destroy all the illusions of the Social-Democratic workers, which have bound them to capitalism for many years. And at the same time by developing the united front we want to set the masses of the proletariat into motion, and to convince them of their own strength and power.

With the aid of the united front we can destroy the terrorist discipline of the fascists, destroy the shameful Hitlerite salute, the semi-military roll-calls in the factories, and put an end to the punishment system in the forced labor camps. We can struggle against the law of the "regularization of labor" and the law on the youth, against the "village assistants",* and we can obtain advances in wages and the recognition of elected trustees. With the help of the united front we shall be able to conduct a more successful struggle for freedom of speech and press, and for freedom to organize in trade unions. We must explain all this to all the Social-Democrats and all our class comrades in Germany. By means of the united front we shall be able to bring the masses closer to the proletarian revolution.

This is how we must prove to the whole Party the need for this new policy, for the change which we wish to bring about.

When we explain to our comrades and to our Social-Democratic class comrades that objective circumstances are becoming ever more favorable, that the difficulties facing fascism are growing and that all that is lacking is a united front embracing many millions, we shall be able at the same time to show them how close revolutionary battles are at hand, and make them understand that the overthrow of the Hitler government is in reality a direct and important aim towards which we must direct our joint struggle against fascism.

THE GROWTH OF PARTIAL STRIKE ACTIONS

In spite of the difficult conditions of the terrorist dictatorship in Germany a characteristic feature of the working-class movement there is a growth in the number of small partial strikes taking place. There is an increasing tendency for spontaneous struggles to break out, but at the same time organized partial struggles are becoming more frequent.

* Unemployed youth sent to compulsory work in the villages at miserable rates of pay.—Ed.

We are quite correct in stating that the organizing and leading role of the Party has increased in the recent period. But all these partial struggles do not now go beyond the bounds of the struggle of isolated sections and categories of workers. The very forms of the small partial struggles also show that we are only at the beginning of the crisis of the Hitler dictatorship. The most prevalent forms are protests made by bodies of workers, and in this connection the despatch of delegations to the councils of trustees and to the directors, and passive resistance.

Strikes, mostly brief ones, are being conducted mainly by skilled workers. Recently there has been an increase in the number of strikes. In some cases the mere threat of a strike has been sufficient to prevent a wage-cut. In most cases, things do not go so far as the adoption of formal decisions to organize strikes. The call to down tools comes mostly from bold comrades, then passed from mouth to mouth, and when one of the workers leaves his machine, it is the signal for work to be stopped. This is the general rule, but some mistakes are also made. Often after stopping work the workers do not come out of the factory but remain inactive in their places, discussing and waiting for the results of the negotiations with the council of trustees and the directors. Only in a few cases have matters reached the point where all the workers leave the factory. In two cases, *e.g.*, in Elmhorst, the workers left the factory, organized a demonstration through the town and marched in an organized way to the directors' offices. Recently there have been repeated demonstrations of all the workers of a given factory or various groups of workers to the offices of the management.

In almost all strikes the police and even the special police of the storm troops (*Feldpolizei*) are immediately informed. Then, under the pressure of the police, the fascist commissars of the "Labor Front" try to persuade the workers to renew work. Very often the workers capitulate. In a number of cases, however, the employers had been forced to make concessions, and in spite of the presence of the police and of the special "*Feldpolizei*", the workers have refused to go back to work. This shows that partial economic struggles in Germany are very rapidly growing into political struggles.

MANY-SIDED FORMS OF WORKING-CLASS RESISTANCE

The forms of resistance are extremely many-sided. For example, at the time when the increase in armaments began in Germany, when there was a shortage of labor power in some branches of industry, and a shortage of skilled, trained workers, there were cases when groups of workers, when their demands were not granted, declared that their agreements were ended, so that they could exert pressure in this way on their employers, and compel them to grant the demands of the workers. This took on its clearest form in Bremen, where some groups of workers succeeded in taking advantage of the struggle between the employers for skilled workers.

The small partial struggles of the workers are usually still of a defensive character, but entire staffs in enterprises or definite sections of them are already coming forward with their demands.

Here are some examples of actions by the workers in the recent period. At the railway station in Stuttgart the workers engaged in laying the track quit work. They demanded payment according to the scale which had been abolished on the establishment of the fascist dictatorship. The strike lasted two days. The workers won. At a metal-

lurgical plant a strike took place for similar demands. It lasted three days. This is the most prolonged strike held recently. The other strikes have so far been short ones and have lasted only a few hours or half a day.

In one factory in Frankfurt the workers quit work. They put forward a number of demands. They succeeded in getting their demands granted. At one works in Berlin the turners demanded a 15 per cent wage increase. For 30 turners they obtained a 7 per cent increase and for the others, 5 per cent. At other place, 40 tool-makers secured wage increases of 4 per cent to 9 per cent. At a factory in Wuppertal, the workers secured a 25 per cent increase for work on the night shift. Before this strike the workers had held a strike against the attempts of the employers to reduce wages. Many such examples can be given.

It should be noted that spontaneous expressions of discontent are very strong among the oppositionally inclined workers in the storm troops and the N.S.B.O.* It frequently happens that these workers take the lead of the whole staff when action is taken. Hence it follows that the better the anti-fascist workers learn to utilize legal possibilities, the better will they succeed in acting jointly with the oppositional Nazi workers. Thus in a number of cases the workers have succeeded in defending their proposals before the council of trustees or in securing the resignation of the council of trustees and the appointment of a new one. The fact that our tactics in the election of the councils of trustees were correct is also proved by the fact that the councils of trustees in many cases are taking the side of the workers and entering into conflicts with the employers. Many members of the councils of trustees are being removed, and many are being sent to concentration camps.

THE GROWTH OF CLASS SOLIDARITY

It is very important to emphasize that solidarity is gradually becoming stronger, the denunciations which used to take place formerly are becoming rarer, and as a result the big factories are compelled to maintain their own factory police. The workers are beginning once again to struggle for their representatives, and to protect them. There have been cases when solidarity has required great material sacrifices. And these sacrifices were made. I will give one example:

A group of workers got work. When they were taken to their place of work, a Storm Trooper made a speech. His arguments were interrupted by the interjections of another Storm Trooper from among the workers. The directors demanded that the person who interrupted should voluntarily come forward. This, however, he did not do. Then the management stated that the workers must hand over this person, under the threat of dismissal and disallowance of unemployment relief for five years. In spite of the threats made, the management did not achieve the surrender of this person. As a result, the group of workers were dismissed. Then another group of workers were instructed to look for this person. But threats of dismissal and disallowance of relief for five years did not help. The workers refused to carry out the demands of the management, and were also dismissed.

Here is another example. In a certain factory during the inflation period, the workers established a mutual aid club in which there was a balance of 13,000 marks. The National-Socialists wanted to appropriate

* The Nazi factory organization.

this money, to "unify" the club with a State institution, and to turn it into a life insurance society. At a general meeting of the workers concerned, a 56-year-old man got up and spoke against the attempt. He was arrested. Then two others spoke and they were also arrested. In spite of this, however, the National-Socialists did not succeed in carrying out their intentions, and had to beat a retreat.

At an airplane factory a spontaneous protest of the workers broke out. One worker threw his tools through the window and was arrested. After this six others demanded their pay and walked out in sympathy. There are many such examples in Germany.

Solidarity sometimes spreads beyond the limits of the working class. There is a danger that some bourgeois elements are trying to use this in their own interests. But at the same time we see that proletarian solidarity is helping to create the anti-fascist people's front. In a certain textile factory in the west, the workers demanded the abolition of deductions from their wages for "winter aid". Under the pressure of the workers the manager of the firm agreed to satisfy this demand. The Board of Directors heard of this and dismissed the manager. After this the workers held a demonstration carrying posters with various slogans, including one with the demand for the reinstatement of the director.

The decisive thing is that these small partial struggles create the prerequisites for a broad united front, because they are already the expression of the common will to struggle and the first step towards the formation of the united front. The whole question is how to lead the working masses by this path to more developed and higher forms of struggle.

WAYS OF ESTABLISHING CONTACTS WITH THE MASSES

In the difficult conditions of the fascist dictatorship, the German Communists have sometimes to seek for primitive ways of establishing contacts with the working masses. Several examples of this may be given. In a certain pit, our comrades made a first attempt to test how far the workers were desirous of struggle. With this end in view, they suggested that at a general meeting to be held, the workers should refuse to sing the song with which such meetings are opened in Germany under the fascist dictatorship (it is a new song introduced by the National-Socialists). Unexpectedly, all the workers agreed to this proposal. The chairman who opened the meeting and proposed that they all sing the song (he had to begin it himself) sang alone. Unfortunately it is impossible to give here in full a splendid letter written to us by our comrade on this matter. The letter includes the following words: "Each of us felt that this was the *first* step towards unity of action." Thus, the first primitive step is the attempt to discover the sentiments of the workers in the given factory. But now this first step has been taken, the comrades are thinking that among these workers they will be able in a short time to build up an organization.

In a big factory in Berlin the workers sent a delegation with a petition to the foreman. The delegation met with no success. Then the workers sent a delegation to the "council of trustees" with a demand that a meeting be called. On receiving a refusal, the workers themselves called a meeting in their workshop, and thus, despite the terror, broke through the framework of fascist legality. The results of such beginnings are shown by the following example: at a certain textile factory in Lausitz where a wage-cut was carried through, the

workers left their work and made their way to the management offices. The wage-cut was withdrawn. Encouraged by this success, the workers demanded an increase of two marks a week. By struggle they obtained this as well.

Here are two more examples showing how the organizing role of the Party is beginning to be felt. At a certain flour mill overtime was not being paid for. Our cell addressed a proposal to the Social-Democratic group that unity of action should be undertaken in the struggle for the payment of overtime. The Social-Democrats agreed. Then the workers sent a delegation to the "council of trustees". The latter defended the demands of the workers, but were immediately dismissed by the employers and replaced by others. In reply to this the workers left their work, organized a demonstration through the town and went to the management offices, which stood apart from the mill. The management called in the police. When the police found themselves faced with solid ranks of the workers, they used demagogic measures—they arrested the manager of the factory and the newly appointed "council of trustees". What is more, this newly appointed "council of trustees", had been compelled, under the pressure of the workers, to march with them through the town. The workers succeeded in securing the satisfaction of all their demands and the old "council of trustees" was reinstated.

This action led to a situation where the workers in all the factories began to put forward their demands and took steps against the law regarding the dismissal of young workers, which was felt with special force in this locality. As a result, the operation of this fascist measure was prevented in a number of factories. Another result of this activity was that the question of the formation of trade unions in the factories began to be discussed in the other factories of this district. Immediately a beginning was made of the construction of free trade unions. Thus, one single demand, on the basis of which the united front was brought about, led to such fruitful results.

Our comrades write to us about the favorable results of our work in an artificial silk factory as follows:

"We Communists and Social-Democrats, members of the former free trade unions, have organized a close illegal union among ourselves. We are also drawing into it the oppositionally inclined storm troopers, especially those who have authority among them. We have therefore twice been able to hold a strike in the spinning shop. We sent a mixed delegation to the management. The delegation was not received. Then we declared a strike. The strike was successful. Two weeks later we struck again and held a demonstration. We made quite a procession as we marched through all the departments in the factory and made our way to the management offices. As a result all our demands were satisfied."

Take another example. In a shipbuilding yard the workers had to listen to a speech by Hitler. The next morning they were to have come to work an hour earlier to make up for the time lost. Our cell immediately came to an agreement with the Social-Democratic workers and the former trade union officials. Together they put forward the slogan that all should come to work at the usual time. The next morning out of a total staff of 700 men only the police and a few Brownshirt officials came to work at the time fixed by the management. Then the management ordered that deductions be made from the wages for the lost hour. The workers immediately threatened to strike, and

by this means secured the withdrawal of the reduction. In the same enterprise, owing to the action referred to, the question was raised of re-establishing the free trade unions. Several other examples could be given of how a movement which arose in a particular enterprise led to the question being raised of the re-establishment of the free trade unions.

The question arises here as to how these partial struggles should be connected up and raised to a higher level of the mass struggle. This can only be done with the aid of a live and broad united front.

We must therefore welcome the fact that one of our district committees has given a new example of how to conclude united front agreements and to establish united front committees with Social-Democratic groups and also with a group of the Socialist Workers' Party and the Reichsbanner.

It is also possible by means of the united front to raise the struggle inside the fascist mass organizations to a higher level, and to undermine the fascist law of "totality". It will be easier with the help of the united front to utilize the traditions of the free trade unions, to intensify the struggle for the right to elect representatives in the "Labor Front", and to make wider use of its lower officials in our interests.

Our weakness in the sphere of mass work in the fascist organizations will most easily be eliminated if we establish unity of action with the Social-Democratic and Christian workers.* A number of examples show that our supporters have been able to make use of the "Labor Front" and to occupy the lower posts there. These examples, however, have been insufficiently used so far, and the experience has not been made known to the entire Party. On this question we must without question catch up on lost time. Following the "unification" of the trade unions, the Social-Democratic workers secured quite a large number of such posts. And insofar as these workers form a united front with us Communists we can also utilize these lower posts in the "Labor Front" in the interests of the joint struggle.

We have also examples to provide a picture of the sentiments prevailing in the country, in the "Labor Front".

At a certain metallurgical plant a vote was taken among the workers regarding deductions to be made from wages for "winter aid". In spite of all the speeches of the "Labor Front" officials, and in spite of the terror, 600 out of 1,000 voted against the reduction. At the same time at a certain mine in Upper Silesia a meeting of the "Labor Front" was called. At this meeting the discussion was of such a kind that the "Labor Front" leaders had to inform the police. Flying squads were called in, but this method, however, was insufficient to maintain the workers at the meeting.

In all parts of the country police chiefs have issued warnings to supporters of the "Labor Front", and members of the Socialist Party of Germany, etc., threatening to arrest them. For example, the chief of police in Schwemmingen threatened to arrest anyone who shouted an interruption expressing Marxist ideas. In the Ruhr district and the Lower Rhine the National-Socialist Party has had to carry through a special campaign because mass desertions from the "Labor Front" have

* Christian workers, i.e., workers who belonged to the "Christian Trade Unions", i.e., unions organized on the basis of common religious faith.—Ed.

recently been observed, and there has been an increase of opposition of the workers at meetings of the "Labor Front".

THE FIGHT TO RE-ESTABLISH THE FREE TRADE UNIONS

In this connection, the restoration of the free trade unions is of decisive importance. The C.P.G. has now officially advanced the slogan of the re-establishment of the free trade unions, as the basic and central task facing the working class. We have done this too late. We thought that it was possible to re-establish the free trade unions without calling the attention of the enemy by wide propaganda on an all-German scale. Therefore, in the materials issued by the Center, we gave unclear and indistinct formulations. Our leading Party workers, right up to the end of October, did not in their articles advance the slogan of the re-establishment of the free trade unions in so many words. We have thus lost a favorable moment which can only be made up by rapidly bringing about the united front with the Social-Democratic workers for the re-establishment of the free trade unions.

We do not want to organize Communist trade unions, we need *mass* trade unions, mass in the sense that they will unite anti-fascists of various trends and tendencies, and that the leaders and functionaries in these organizations will be of such a composition as to reflect the will of the masses to establish trade union unity in the free trade unions. We know that in present circumstances we must build up not such mass organizations as the Social-Democrats understand them but organizations having strong and vital contacts with the masses.

In order to accelerate the formation of such class organizations we are instructing our organizational units to conclude united front pacts with the Social-Democratic organizations and leaders of the restoration of the free trade unions. We are also ready, with this end in view, to conclude a pact with the leaders of the Left groups, with the higher officials of the former trade unions and even with the "Prague" Social-Democratic leaders, so as to prevent the split arising again, playing, as it would, only into the hands of the fascists.

As the formation of free trade unions depends on the whole on whether a united front is established for this purpose in the factories, we call on our factory cells and all comrades in the factories who sympathize with us to make a bold approach to the Social-Democratic workers with this end in view. Our efforts to include the R.T.U.O. (Red Trade Union Opposition) and the Red trade unions as rapidly as possible in the free trade unions which will have to be formed together with the Social-Democratic comrades, show that we want to do everything possible to establish trade union unity in the free trade unions. We Communists, therefore, will also work for the liquidation of the district committees of the R.T.U.O., as they are frequently a hindrance towards the re-establishment of the free trade unions. It is very important to convince the supporters of the R.T.U.O. and the Red trade unions of the necessity for this policy.

A beginning has already been made in the organization of free trade unions. Thirty-seven trade union groups have been formed in the Lower Rhine region. A centralized leadership is already being organized there for the free trade unions of textile and metal workers. In the process of re-establishing the textile workers' union, we have so far set up 22 groups. Fifteen groups have already been organized with a view to re-establishing the metal workers' union; and in addition

there are several groups of sympathizers. Our weakness is that our comrades in the factories have not succeeded in making an approach to responsible Social-Democratic officials so as to hasten the development of these trade union groups in the factories.

In the southwest we have begun to set up a chemical workers' union, which must first of all be consolidated in the chemical plants. The former Social-Democratic trade union organizations are rendering us energetic assistance in this regard. In Berlin a start has been made in the organization of a metal workers' union, in the Ruhr district of a miners' union, and in Saxony, of a textile workers' union. Reports arriving from all parts of the country show that the workers take a very sympathetic attitude towards this activity.

This fact that the workers want to form trade unions was utilized by the Right Social-Democratic leaders to try to set up their own trade union groups on the basis of the old reformist policy. This means once again to organize the trade union split of the working class. So as to hinder the work of such splitters, of such supporters of coalition with the bourgeoisie, we make it obligatory on all Communists, in places where such groups are set up, to join them and bring about their unification with other trade union groups. In the re-establishment of the free trade unions, the main thing in any case is, as we have already emphasized, the establishment of a united front. But it is precisely in this sphere that we have shown the greatest weakness, and this has hindered the re-establishment of the free trade unions.

We have met with resistance to the formation of free trade unions. Some Party organizations have thought that this was a Right-wing line. Others claimed that the free trade unions were too much discredited, although the A.D.G.B.* had 4,500,000 members before the establishment of the Hitler dictatorship. Brandler, for example, is of such an opinion. Others declared that the revolutionary nature of the trade unions should now be openly stressed. As a result of this, formulations such as "revolutionary trade unions" and "Red trade unions" have appeared, with the repudiation of the slogan of free trade unions. It is quite clear that such views hinder the development of the united front.

AGAINST SECTARIANISM

It follows from this that we must carry on a strong ideological struggle against the sectarianism in our Party, the more so because we, the leaders, are ourselves responsible to a certain degree for this. We have often limited ourselves to an abstract struggle of principles against the Social-Democratic leaders, and in this way we have in fact nourished sectarianism. We have not made a distinction between the "Left" and Right leaders in the "Prague" C.C. This appeared in one of my articles, a fact which shows that sectarianism has had a certain influence on us as well.

And these mistakes of ours have been utilized in an anti-Party spirit by the conciliatory groups. We forgot that under the leadership of Comrade Thaelmann, the C.P.G. always conducted a struggle on two fronts so as to ensure that we operated the line of the Communist International, and that this struggle on two fronts was conducted on the basis of inner-Party self-criticism.

Sectarianism is the main obstacle hindering our united front policy.

* The German reformist Trade Union Congress.

At the present time sectarianism hinders the development of mass work in the fascist mass organizations. We have stated to our own mass organizations that illegal mass organizations can only exist in the fascist conditions of Germany if they have firmly consolidated their influence in organizations of the enemy. However, it is not sufficient merely to talk about this. Without a united front policy we shall not be able to bring about the real organization of an opposition inside the fascist mass organizations. Our sportsmen therefore must everywhere find an approach to the former members of the Workers' Sport and Gymnastics Association. Our Freethinkers must draw nearer to the former supporters of Sievers.* Our members of the War Victims' Association must draw nearer to the former members of the War Victims' Association with a view to carrying on a joint struggle inside the fascist mass organizations.

This united front from below creates good prerequisites for the operation of our general line, of our united front policy. The experience which we already possess shows this. The best examples in this direction are provided by the sport movement, where we have already obtained influence over a considerable number of sports unions in Germany. There are similar examples in other fascist mass organizations as well. It is, of course, difficult to make these examples publicly known. But we cannot get on without making them known. We must do everything to practice the exchange of experiences between our Party organizations on the widest possible scale.

In many parts of Germany Reichsbanner groups still exist under various radical names. Our Red Front Fighters' Organization does not conduct a united front policy in relation to them.

Sometimes such groups of the former Reichsbanner use extremely radical language (for example, they state that socialist aims can only be achieved by the armed struggle of a Red Army, and that all efforts should be directed towards the formation of a Red Army), but at the same time they reject mass work inside the fascist mass organizations, and they describe the restoration of the free trade unions as the resurrection of the reformist policy. Instead of getting into contact with such active workers and educating them in the spirit of our revolutionary policy, explaining the worthlessness of their views, some of our comrades try to outdo them in the use of radical phrases. We are, of course, in favor of the establishment of a Red Army, but the path towards a Red Army is that of a mass policy, is work in the mass organizations, in the "Labor Front", work to establish the united front, so as to raise the struggle of the workers to a higher level.

We want to take a serious line for the establishment of the united front with a view to creating a single fighting organization of the proletariat, but the way this organization shall be named is not a question of principle, but one of arrangement with the Social-Democratic workers, and of drawing them on an extensive scale into the formation of such an organization.

WORK IN THE STORM DETACHMENTS

Sectarianism in the Party has also hindered us in carrying on mass work in the storm detachments with a view to disintegrating them, and has prevented us from drawing the members of the storm detachments

* Sievers—the leader of the Social-Democratic Freethinkers' Organization.

into the struggle. Our comrades often say this to us: "We cannot enter a united front with those who have beaten us up, who have tortured us, and evicted us from our houses. There can be no question of such a thing!" On the other hand, the workers in the storm detachments often put the question: "After all the frightful things that we have done, do the Communists want to allow us among them?" We must put an end to the sectarian attitude to this question.

Matters are just the same in respect to the re-establishment of the free trade unions. Our comrades often say: "What, we have to organize free trade unions with those who immediately allow themselves to be 'unified' by the fascist State, and who immediately capitulated!" This is how sectarianism makes itself felt in the most varied forms.

The Social-Democratic workers have come to us and said: "We want to join the free trade union groups, but we earn so little that we cannot pay two sets of dues—to the free trade unions and to the 'Labor Front'. We do not want, however, to leave the 'Labor Front' yet." Our comrades thought that they were acting in a revolutionary manner when they established unbearable membership dues! As though the will to undertake the class struggle can only express itself in membership dues! Of course, many Social-Democratic workers have a very weak appreciation of the importance of re-establishing free trade unions. Such workers say: "We are in the 'Labor Front' and we think that we can reorganize it along trade union lines." Our comrades often refuse to convince these Social-Democratic workers.

OUR POLICY TOWARDS THE YOUTH

Sectarianism is now very much in evidence among us also *in our policy towards the youth*. Our Party has payed insufficient attention to the leadership of the youth. In connection with the fact that the fascists carry on chauvinistic incitement and social demagogy, and try in every way to consolidate their influence on the youth (in accordance with what they have in view regarding the prospects of war and the avoidance of proletarian revolution), our Party must pay more serious attention to the struggle to win over the youth.

Fascism sees that the youth, considerable sections of whom supported it, are now beginning to become a serious danger to it. Fascism is therefore exerting every effort to preserve its influence on the youth. The main thing is that our leading Party bodies should give better guidance to the Y.C.L. regarding mass work and the development of the united front, so that they themselves should undertake more energetic leadership in the struggle against the law on the employment of youth and against the sending of young workers into the village, and that our Party organizations should themselves set an example of the united front between the Y.C.Lers and the Young Socialists.

The Y.C.L. on its own part must widely and boldly formulate the smallest demands raised by the enslaved youth, and popularize them so as to be able to lead the youth into the struggle. With a view to joint action it must try to get into contact with the numerous discontented organizations, not only the Young Socialists, but all other groups. This can only be done with the help of our Party.

The central question in the sphere of our policy towards the youth is the struggle against chauvinism. A clear example of this is pro-

carried on by the fascists had the strongest influence on the masses of the youth. The twofold demagoguery of Hitler—to the effect that “we want peace but we demand equality of armaments” has its effect on the youth in thousands of varieties of chauvinism.

The results of the Saar plebiscite were a serious warning for us, and reminded us of the necessity of intensifying the struggle everywhere against chauvinism. But in this direction we shall only be successful if we at the same time struggle against the calculations of the Social-Democrats to the effect that help will come to the German people from outside. Help from outside means the struggle of the international proletariat. We ourselves must secure our liberty in our own country. In the difficult conditions of illegality we are ourselves in danger of dropping into an attitude which is nationally restricted. Therefore, in the struggle against national chauvinism, we must energetically spread internationalism. If we strengthen it in our own ranks, we shall be in a better position to struggle against National-Socialism.

Our program for national and social liberation is an important weapon in the struggle against nationalism and chauvinism. But we must learn to use this weapon better.

THE ANTI-FASCIST PEOPLE'S FRONT

The united front is the driving belt to the anti-fascist people's front! But the mere slogan of the people's front alone is insufficient to develop a broad fighting movement against fascism. We must infuse a living content into this slogan. Proof of the fact that the prerequisites for the formation of a broad people's front exist is provided by the growing discontent of the urban petty bourgeoisie and the peasants, the intellectuals and the students. Our comrades tell us that in quite a number of places any one using the Hitler salute attracts attention to himself, and is looked on with the greatest distrust. In reality it may be said that in many places the Hitler salute has been wiped out.

At a butchers' meeting in Berlin, at which 2,000 persons were present, a big scandal took place in this connection. A meeting of coal traders in Berlin—about the same number—held a demonstration against forced contributions, and against the Hitler salute, and thus against the regime. A few days ago a meeting of hairdressers in Berlin-Neukoelln was held in which 400 persons took part. This meeting was also very stormy. Ninety-five per cent of the audience demonstrated against those on the platform of the meeting. The Holstein peasants sent in a complaint about the National-Socialist who conducted the elections, stating that he had falsified the results of the elections at the last plebiscite. A large number of peasants, living in this village, in spite of the fierce terror, testified on oath that they had voted against Hitler.

At a peasants' meeting in Plauen a peasant made an oppositional speech. The police were called. The audience scattered. An exhibition was planned in Hessen, but just before it was to be opened it had to be abandoned because the peasants refused to give their produce for the exhibition as a protest against compulsory deductions for “winter aid”. In the peasant markets there have recently been repeated spontaneous protests by peasants against the compulsory delivery of produce and against the fixed prices on fodder. In Brandenburg and Upper Westphalia, where the poor peasants play a big role, discontent with the landlords finds exceptionally sharp expression. Matters have now

gone so far that the peasants state that only the Communists can give them the land.

It is clear from all this that the situation has changed. The Communists can and must again go into the villages from which until recently they were squeezed out in many parts of the country. There is a serious danger here that the oppositional bourgeois groups will succeed in utilizing the opposition of the peasants for their own ends. In Bavaria, for example, the peasants say that a Clerical government will soon be established. In Westphalia there are rumors about the forthcoming coalition of the Center Party (Clerical) with the Social-Democrats.

WORK IN THE VILLAGES

Now it is insufficient for us to act only through "village helpers" in our work among the peasants. We must again set up firm organizational points of support in the villages as the prerequisite for the development of the broad policy of the people's front. Only thus can we come to the help of the peasants. We must learn to seize on the wishes and demands of these strata of the toilers, and formulate and popularize these wishes and demands in the proper form.

The peasants expect from us that we help them in the struggle against the fascist commissaries. The fascist dictatorship, as the open terroristic dictatorship of finance capital, is striving to rob these strata still further, to destroy their organizations by the method of unification, as it has already done with the free trade unions. The urge towards the old organizations will become all the more clear because the peasants have no defense now against the robber methods used by the wholesale traders. The peasants are demanding a return to the old producers' co-operative societies and are protesting against the system of State and semi-State organizations which squeeze the last drop of blood out of them.

In such conditions we are sure of the possibility of developing the united front into a broad anti-fascist people's front, and thus of winning allies for the proletarian revolution, for the people's revolution. To concretize the general line of the anti-fascist policy of the people's front means to help to disintegrate the terrorist organizations, to make the armed forces of fascism unsuitable for the struggle against the people. The linking up of the demands of the workers with those of the urban petty bourgeoisie and with those of the peasants, makes it possible to form a united front between the toilers, and to create a broad people's front. The organization of the united front and the people's front must arise out of life itself. It depends on the activity of the mass policy of the Communist Party as to how far it will win authority among the masses, how far it will organize the forces of the masses. It depends on how energetically it rallies the masses and leads them to the struggle, as to when the fascist dictatorship will be overthrown.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALIST SOVIET GERMANY

In the process of the mass struggles, and of mighty class battles, in the process of the people's revolution, the organs of the united front will turn into the executive organs of the toiling people. Thus, all our friends in the country can see that we have a revolutionary outlook, that our mass policy and the policy of the united front, our policy of the anti-fascist people's front, mean rallying all the toilers for the

struggle against fascism in one direction, namely, for the overthrow of the Hitler dictatorship, for the power of the Soviets.

In the struggle against the National-Socialists, in the struggle against chauvinism, in the struggle for the establishment of a very broad anti-fascist people's front, we tell the toiling people what is written in our program of emancipation. We Communists love our country and our people, our language, and our fatherland, and precisely for this reason we are seeking to overthrow the fascist dictatorship and are fighting for socialist Soviet Germany, for our German working class, for a well-to-do life, for Socialism.

The Process of the Development Toward Fascism

By M. GALAS

DISCUSSIONS about fascism have already passed the stage of general discussion, or at least should have. Every Communist can endorse the assertion that fascism is "the general tendency of the domination of the bourgeoisie in a given period . . ." On the other hand we are all agreed that the fascist process shows itself in the most varied forms, corresponding to given historical and political conditions. If, on the one hand, we may discern elements of fascism even in the American "New Deal" (Roosevelt's policy), then, on the other hand, we can also see quite clearly certain special features in German fascism such as distinguish it from Italian fascism. Hence we cannot, for instance, speak of a German-Italian type of state as of something that goes without saying.

But, when we stress the special features of the various forms of the fascist process, we do not do away with the need for drawing theoretical general conclusions. Unless we study the *law of the specific process of development towards fascism*, our knowledge of fascism as of a "general tendency" will turn out to be very insufficient. When we open up to the very roots the fact that the class essence of fascism is one and the same in different countries, we do not thereby show clearly the basic points which distinguish one form in which fascism expresses itself from another. And these can be exactly defined in a very incomplete fashion by the use of such terms as "the totalitarian state", "governmental fascism", "fascism by the dry road" and other similar terms. The more exactly we define these concepts, the truer will our struggle be against fascism. For we are dealing with a problem which is not an academic one, but with one which is first and foremost a tactical-political question.

Germany, Italy and Austria, for instance, are quite different countries, but all the three of them at the present stage, undoubtedly display all the signs of the "totalitarian" fascist state. Here we leave on one side the question as to how long this form of fascist state will last and as to what direction development will take place in each of these countries. (We shall not deal with Bulgaria and the Baltic states in this connection.) Poland, Hungary and even Yugoslavia represent another type, although we are fully correct in speaking of Polish, Hungarian and Yugoslav fascism when estimating the official policies of these countries.*

The question is as follows: Are Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia advancing to the new state of the German-Italian type? Will the process of fascist development always be of that character?

* As distinct from Germany, Austria and Italy, where parliament has been completely done away with, a new constitution was adopted in Poland last year, a new election law is being prepared in Hungary, while in Yugoslavia negotiations are going on between the various parties in respect to the constitution. All this activity is carried out on the basis of the preservation of parliamentarism. Whereas all parties, except the ruling fascist party, have been done away with in Germany, Austria and Yugoslavia, in Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia on the other hand, various bourgeois parties are in being. In Hungary and Poland there are even Social-Democratic parties in existence.

In both the "authoritarian democracy" of Czechoslovakia and in the age-long democratic fatherland of "organized, controlled and protected freedom", the Laval's French Third Republic, the process of fascist development is the direct and decisive problem of political life. But what direction is this fascist development taking? Is it towards the totalitarian state or towards fascism of the Polish-Hungarian-Yugoslavian type? Is this latter type merely a transition to a developed type of "matured fascism"? Is it inevitable that the fascist process is directed towards a definite point to which all development leads, if the masses of proletarians are unsuccessful in their resistance to fascism? Or is the "parliamentarism" which is regulated by the ruling clique, such a specific form of fascism as is distinct from the fascism of the German-Italian-Austrian type, and is it a completely special and constant type of fascism by comparison with the latter?

The day-to-day political activity of our Polish and Hungarian Parties shows that it is least of all a scholastic point when we raise such questions.

THE GOVERNMENTAL FASCISM OF POLAND, HUNGARY AND YUGOSLAVIA

After the assassination of the Polish Minister of Home Affairs, the Polish Government grew hostile to the "Right-radical" elements. According to the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.), the fascist menace thereby ceased to exist, and therefore it is their view that there are no objective pre-conditions for anti-fascist unity of action. The attitude of the Hungarian Social-Democrats towards fascism in Hungary is a similar one. According to their political dictionary, fascism does not mean the governmental system of Gembes, but the comparatively insignificant "union of members of the Arrow Cross" (Pfeilkreuzler-lager) which arose after the model of the "members of the Swastika union" (Hakenkreutzler-lager). News from Yugoslavia indicates that the government simply proposes to revive Social-Democracy and to give it a new lease of life. There can be no doubts as to the position that will be taken up in relation to fascism by the Social-Democracy thus brought to life again. The policy of the lesser evil as practiced in Hungary and Poland will be the practical expression of this position.

The Communists, of course, will not find it difficult to show that the essence of this "system" in all the three countries mentioned is the dictatorial domination of the most reactionary group of monopoly capital. But this "open terrorist" domination is overlapped by one still more open and still more terroristic. The process of development towards fascism has not been completed in these countries, and the "systems" do not at all wish to take the shape of the "final" system, such as, for instance, exists in Germany, and where, as Messrs. Hitler, Goebbels, Rosenberg and Co. assert, there will be no alterations during the next thousand years, or as in Austria where the god-fearing sons of the Catholic church righteously raise their eyes in woe and are engaged precisely in establishing the Kingdom of God on earth. Nor shall we speak about Mussolini who is constantly harping about the "age of fascism".

In the three countries which we have utilized as examples so as to obtain an exact definition of "governmental fascism", experiments are constantly being undertaken. The speeches of the "statesmen" are a mixture of fascist and liberal expressions and their policy is directed equally against fascism (namely against that which they understand by this term, i.e., against the totalitarian state) and against "democratic

anarchism". Parliament is given now more, now less rights. The most varied reforms have been carried through in Hungary since 1920, in Poland since 1925 and in Yugoslavia since 1929, but the class nature of the political domination in these countries has, however, not altered. These reforms, these interminable waverings, are subordinated to a definite system, namely one and the same inexorable tendency of development as seen through the varying conditions existing in the different countries.

How are the "age-long" ideas of fascism operated? How should "modern reaction" (to use the expression of a Hungarian fascist professor) established by the "new popular forces" be operated in modern conditions? That is the question. What does this "modern reaction" consist of? With what problems does it confront the dominant "governmental fascism"? We Communists, and only we, have already repeatedly pointed to them.

First, we must take note of the fact that freedom of action is destroyed as far as concerns the revolutionary working class movement which threatens the domination of monopoly capital, or at least this freedom is reduced to a minimum.

Second, the dictatorial solution of all material questions and of questions of power among the bourgeoisie themselves, and the fact that the position has been overcome where the small and middle bourgeoisie carry on an uninterrupted struggle through the political representatives to increase the share of profits accruing to them. It is in this sense that we must understand the destruction of what the fascists call the "party system", the "general slackness and anarchy" which threaten the fatherland with final ruin.

From this point of view even the most faint-hearted trade-union policy is called "Marxism", while Marxism, to use the expression of a certain Nazi, is nothing other than the "liberalism of the working class".

And of course, thirdly, when the "northern order of estates" (or correspondingly, the "Roman" order or the "Christian-Austrian" order of estates) which has come to take the place of the "popular restoration" or the "democratic stew", destroys Marxism and the "whole false ideology of the French revolution", then a new apparatus of political power has to be set up, in the sense of more intense centralization, and of a more open and direct terrorist dictatorship.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST "TOTALITARIAN FASCISM"

Fascism (whether in the shape of a "creative upsurge of the Northern blood" or whether in the shape of a "Latin revival") brings about all these aims with a hundred per cent ferocity. If we examine the press and follow the political life of the countries where the fascist process is the central problem or where fascism has not assumed the forms of the "totalitarian state" then we come up against a series of arguments directed against the "fascist revolution". These arguments are not always of a hypocritical character. On the contrary, they are founded on completely realistic political considerations which are partially based on the fascist experience undergone hitherto, and partially arise out of the special features of the situation in the corresponding country. As against all the alluring arguments of totalitarian fascism, the following have to be decisively put forward:

1. The fact that parliamentarism is done away with and that

Social-Democracy is destroyed implies the destruction not only of the Social-Democratic safety valve, but also of all safety valves whatsoever, of all measures to relieve the atmosphere of its tension. In spite of the fact that the "forces of the nation are consolidated"—along with the destruction of the "Party system" and the abolition of the parties within this system—the Communist Party is the only Party which does not allow itself to be done away with, and advances to the forefront in the minds of the masses as the only serious opponent of the fascist system.

2. When the petty bourgeoisie are deprived of the right to participate in the management of the state, it can only take place by rallying the petty bourgeoisie on a broad mass scale. The fascist "organization of the entire productive energy of the nation", which takes the place of the "shapeless mess of universal democratic equality" implies that finance-capital is attempting to transform into life its dream about "organized capitalism" on a national scale. But this *last word* of capitalist development can only clear a way for itself through awakening the ideology of the pre-capitalist "estates".

The process of capitalist reorganization means at the same time that the craft slogans of the middle ages are made use of. The "organized nation" is put in place of the class struggle, while use is made of the philistine ideology of the petty bourgeoisie, who are drawn into politics and are moving to the "Left". The destruction of the political representation of the petty bourgeoisie, and the organization of the masses of the petty bourgeoisie directly around fascist slogans can under certain circumstances cost a very heavy price. The masses of the petty bourgeoisie in a state organized on the "estate" principle can cause greater unrest than the petty-bourgeois politicians belonging to the "democratic stew". Here we only indicate the desperate "anti-fascism" of the Jewish bourgeoisie (who, in Western Europe, constitute an important element of the ruling class).

3. The new state apparatus is an exceptionally expensive affair, and the new situation contains within itself innumerable possibilities of movements away from the path undertaken. Not only the Roman "fascio" and the age-long German "swastika", but even the provincial Heimwehr swallow innumerable millions of money. The attitude of the Party to the state, from the point of view of leadership, is also exceptionally full of contradictions. It is true that dictatorial concentration implies that the decisive elements of the bourgeoisie have direct and uncontrolled influence at their disposal, but as far as the bourgeoisie as a whole are concerned, it is precisely this lack of control and directness which means that they, *i.e.*, the bourgeoisie as a whole, have under certain circumstances, less influence in the conduct of affairs, than under any parliamentary structure.

WHY "GOVERNMENTAL FASCISM" DOES NOT DESIRE A "FASCIST REVOLUTION"

Thus, the objections to and the arguments against the totalitarian state may in general be reduced to the following, namely, that "governmental fascism" would like to critically appropriate the "new ideas of eternal importance", *i.e.*, to make use of only that which is of advantage to it, and to do away with that which is valueless. They would like to transfer the fascist solution of the political and economic problems which arise in the last stage of imperialist development, by way of the firm economic, and political military organization of the nation, into the

real life of their own country, but without reviving the pre-capitalist ideology of the middle ages. It is not because the democratic heritage is too *great* in Poland, Hungary and perhaps Yugoslavia, but because it is too small.

Neither in Hungary nor in Yugoslavia (not even in Poland) is there that powerful urban petty bourgeoisie, sobered from its enthusiasm for democracy, which might become a basis for an anti-democratic, plebian and counter-revolutionary mass movement. Why, then, should the decisive sections of the bourgeoisie undertake an attempt to completely reorganize the whole structure, to bring about "a fascist revolution"?

Why should they revive the slogans of the pre-capitalist state organized on the "estate" principle, if they can bring about national unity and national organization based on "harmony between the classes", and if they can bring about and favor in every way the destruction of "anti-national elements" without going beyond the bounds of parliamentarism, and even while developing it "on modern principles"? Why not "modernize", *i.e.*, why not adapt this parliamentarism which in any case is easily subjected to government "control", to the conditions of fascist domination?

Why should not a statesman, who has not mastered liberalism even to the extent mastered by those who were German, Italian and Austrian ministers under the party system and who have been overthrown, why, then, should he not come forward with liberal arguments? Why operate with an ideology which is a modernized version of that of the middle ages and is anti-parliamentary, anti-liberal and pseudo-democratic in a country where live traditions are in existence of a "parliamentary" ideology which is anti-democratic and pseudo-liberal?

There can be no doubt whatsoever that this attempt to carry through the fascist process without displaying the "bad sides of fascism", to carry on, so to speak, the fascist process without "the fascist revolution", *i.e.*, to carry through the fascist process on the basis of the existing historical pre-conditions, opens up wide political possibilities as far as the proletariat is concerned. While we, as against Social-Democracy, point to the purely fascist content of "governmental" fascism, we must, on the other hand, carry on the struggle with all our power against the extreme "Left" opportunism which attaches not the slightest importance to the distinctions which exist between the various stages of the fascist process. "Governmental fascism" is an opponent in principle, of the "fascist revolution"; this "organic" development and the introduction of the "good sides" of fascism, this, so to speak, "fascist reformism" implies at the same time that the mass movement of the working class is provided with possibilities for action of a partial character, and that it becomes possible to organize resistance to fascism on a wider basis.

FRANCE AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

We have quoted those countries where pseudo-parliamentarism has been in the saddle, and where there is no corresponding basis for a large-scale fascist mass movement, as an example of fascism which honestly admires totalitarian fascism from a distance, while at the same time displaying an honest repulsion to it in its own country. Is it not strange that it is possible to observe a completely similar development in those places where the masses preserve old and quite strong *democratic traditions*? The fascist process in France and Czechoslovakia is moving not in the direction of Italo-German fascism but of Polish-Hungarian

fascism. Not because democratic traditions are so small that it would not be worth while to organize a big mass movement to overthrow parliamentary institutions, but because they are so strong, that no mass movement, at any rate, for the time being, could do away with them all of a sudden.

The classic method used by the bourgeoisie in managing the masses of the people has preserved such traditions that fascism cannot advance in the struggle against these traditions, but rather through "developing" them. And it stands to reason that in the country where there is a newspaper which has an exceptionally strong fascist smell, and which bears the title of Marat's newspaper, the *Ami du Peuple*, in the country where the fascists "pull the Jacobean cap over their eyes", the fascist process is dragging out at a longer rate than in the country where the parliamentary system is defended against the "corporative" idea only because "regulated" parliamentarism represents in the country concerned a far better form of fascism, one which is more national, than is totalitarian fascism. In the country where the bourgeoisie has control of its own traditional methods of organizing the people, fascism as the "conception and development of the new order" has to overcome far more difficulties than in the country where it was born in the process of a fascist "revolution" or in the country where the application of fascist methods is only a new method of holding the masses of the people as far as possible away from politics.

There can be no doubt that the Franco-Czechish type of the development towards fascism, is something quite different from "matured fascism", the type which we can call one hundred per cent governmental fascism. Whereas governmental fascism has in many respects been bold enough to learn very much from totalitarian fascism, taking from it its methods of approach to the masses, and in the ideological sphere its ideas of "authoritarian democracy" and "organized and protected liberty", fascism of the French and Czech type in general tests the decisive influence of precisely those experiments which strive to bring about fascism without its "shady sides". Hence if the unity of action of the proletariat does not put a stop to the further process of development towards fascism there can be no doubt that a new type of fascism, which has not yet taken shape will develop. And "Anglo-American democracy which is undergoing a crisis" (Lloyd George), will also strive to reach this new type as an ideal.

The numerous contradictions within fascism are so clearly to be seen at the present time that a number of fascist states have already more or less consciously set themselves the task of doing away with these contradictions, i.e., of overcoming the "foolish sides of fascism". As a result of this, a new contradiction has risen. Both in France and America the masses cannot be simply withdrawn from the process of "national revival" as in Eastern Europe, but in both cases fascism does not for the time being wish to adopt the "foolish sides" of the process of the rebirth of "age-old" ideas. But if in both cases the "modern development of democracy" is the main slogan of fascist revisionism, then the defense of democracy opens up wide possibilities for the struggle against fascism. Governmental fascism has exposed the contradiction throughout the world which Communist tactics must fundamentally bear in mind and utilize.

“Herr Eugen Duehring’s Revolution in Science” (Anti-Duehring)

By Frederick Engels*

By T. B.

THE publication in English of the complete text of the *Anti-Duehring* fills at long last a big gap in the Marxist literature of the English-speaking countries. Since the '90's of the last century, the three chapters translated from the original into French by Paul Lafargue under the title of *The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science*, and retranslated from the French into English, has been exceedingly popular among English students of Marxism. This pamphlet has been reproduced over and over again. It was not till 1907 that there appeared a fuller work by the Kerr Publishing House of New York, under the title of *Landmarks of Scientific Socialism*, translated and edited by the American Socialist Austin Lewis.

These years were marked by the wave of revisionism that swept through the Second International. The opportunist highlights of the Second International were declaring Marxism and Marx to be out of date; Bernstein in Germany, MacDonald and Snowden in England, the then theoreticians of the I.L.P. and the Labor Party, Lewis and others in the U.S.A.

The palm for this distortion and perversion of Marxism must, in our opinion, be awarded to Austin Lewis. With the lofty detachment of the liberal professor, Lewis cuts out whole pages and a chapter of the most vital sections of Engels' work; valuable footnotes are omitted, and, to add insult to injury, he writes an introduction of 16 pages and an appendix of five pages in an effort to belittle the role of Engels as leader of the proletarian socialist movement.

Listen to this: “The remnants of early Victorianism cling persistently to Engels. He is in many respects the revolutionist of '48, a bourgeois politician possessed at intervals by a proletarian ghost; such as he says himself ever haunts the bourgeois”, “His arguments on the dialectic are commonplaces today which it would be a work of supererogation to explain to anyone except *the persistent victim of little Bethel*” (our italics). To Mr. Lewis the shafts of ridicule from Bernard Shaw are “more fatal than all the solemn German philosophy” of Engels; “Mechanical Socialism”, the enemy of Engels, has passed away; “Engels is out of date”, and so forth.

Such stuff, worthy of a liberal professor, was served up as “Marxism” to the thousands of English working-class students eager to study Marx and Engels. It is high time this bourgeois rubbish were banished from our literature.

Of the Bolshevik Party and Lenin's masterful criticism of the distorters of Marx and Engels, the English socialist and labor move-

* *Herr Eugen Duehring's Revolution in Science (Anti-Duehring)*. Translated by Emile Burns. Edited by C.P. Dutt. Published by International Publishers, New York, and Martin Lawrence, London.

ment knew practically nothing until the October Revolution. Now, thanks to the October Revolution, the "wonderfully rich and instructive" classics of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin are being made available to the revolutionary proletariat in all lands, preparing the decisive struggle against international imperialism. Of these classics the *Anti-Duehring* is outstanding.

In the *Anti-Duehring* Engels gives a brilliant exposition of the basic ideas of Marxism in the fields of philosophy, science, political economy and socialism. It represents, as the publishers say, in the fullest sense a product of the fruitful collaboration of Marx and Engels. Marx not only read through the whole work but himself contributed one of the chapters.

The book is tastefully gotten up on good paper and clearly printed. An excellent publication, we think it would have been worth the trouble and enhanced the value of the book if it had been given an historical introduction by the editors, and, what is indispensable for every good book, an index. We commend these defects to the notice of the publishers should they issue a reprint.

BEGINNING
May 7th

By EARL BROWDER

What Is Communism?

A series of authoritative articles by the General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. They deal in question and answer form with fundamental questions. Browder discusses the position of the middle class, whose situation today he clarifies in concrete terms, and shows the need of that class to support the proletariat.

NEW MASSES

ON THE NEWSSTANDS EVERY THURSDAY

— TRIAL OFFER —

NEW MASSES
31 East 27th St., New York, N. Y.

I enclose \$1 for 15 weeks of *New Masses*.

Name

Street and No.

City and State

Occupation

REACH THE MILLIONS

with these pamphlets

THE TRUTH ABOUT FATHER COUGHLIN

By A. B. MAGIL03

THE REAL HUEY P. LONG

By SENDER GARLIN03

HOW CAN WE SHARE THE WEALTH?

By ALEX BITTELMAN03

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

By EARL BROWDER03

WE ARE FOR H. R. 2827

*Report of the Committee on Labor to the House of
Representatives*02

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE SOVIET UNION

By V. M. MOLOTOV03

FOOD FOR ALL

ABOLITION OF THE BREAD-CARD SYSTEM

By V. M. MOLOTOV03

N.R.A., MARTIAL LAW, "INSURRECTION"

THE MINERS' STRIKE IN NEW MEXICO

By PAT TOOHEY05

•

Into the organizations with our literature!

Every Party Member a Distributor of Literature!

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City